

TO AUTHORIZE MEDALS COMMEMORATING THE  
BICENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

---

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

**H.R. 7987**

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE STRIKING OF MEDALS IN  
COMMEMORATION OF THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE  
AMERICAN REVOLUTION

---

JUNE 29, 1971

---

Printed for the use of the  
Committee on Banking and Currency



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1971

## COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas, *Chairman*

WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania  
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, Missouri  
HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin  
THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Ohio  
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Pennsylvania  
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., Georgia  
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Texas  
JOSEPH G. MINISH, New Jersey  
RICHARD T. HANNA, California  
TOM S. GETTYS, South Carolina  
FRANK ANNUNZIO, Illinois  
THOMAS M. REES, California  
TOM BEVILL, Alabama  
CHARLES H. GRIFFIN, Mississippi  
JAMES M. HANLEY, New York  
FRANK J. BRASCO, New York  
BILL CHAPPELL, Jr., Florida  
EDWARD I. KOCH, New York  
WILLIAM R. COTTER, Connecticut  
PARREN J. MITCHELL, Maryland

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, New Jersey  
FLORENCE P. DWYER, New Jersey  
ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Pennsylvania  
J. WILLIAM STANTON, Ohio  
BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN, Georgia  
GARRY BROWN, Michigan  
LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, Pennsylvania  
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio  
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts  
PHILIP M. CRANE, Illinois  
JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, California  
STEWART B. MCKINNEY, Connecticut  
NORMAN F. LENT, New York  
BILL ARCHER, Texas  
BILL FRENZEL, Minnesota

PAUL NELSON, *Clerk and Staff Director*

CURTIS A. PRINS, *Chief Investigator*

BENET D. GELLMAN, *Counsel*

JOSEPH C. LEWIS, *Professional Staff Member*

GARY TABAK, *Counsel*

ORMAN S. FINK, *Minority Staff Member*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, Missouri, *Chairman*

ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., Georgia  
HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Texas  
JOSEPH G. MINISH, New Jersey  
RICHARD T. HANNA, California  
FRANK ANNUNZIO, Illinois  
JAMES M. HANLEY, New York  
BILL CHAPPELL, Jr., Florida  
EDWARD I. KOCH, New York

FLORENCE P. DWYER, New Jersey  
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio  
LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, Pennsylvania  
MARGARET M. HECKLER, Massachusetts  
BILL ARCHER, Texas  
STEWART B. MCKINNEY, Connecticut

CHARLES B. HOLSTEIN, *Professional Staff Member*



## CONTENTS

Text of H.R. 7987.....	3
Section-by-section analysis of H.R. 7987.....	3
Report of the Treasury Department.....	5

### STATEMENTS

Brooks, Hon. Mary T., Director, U.S. Mint; accompanied by Roy Cahoon, public information officer.....	17
Cerullo, Michael C., Jr., director of commemorative issues, the Robbins Co., Attleboro, Mass.....	90
Dickey, Hon. William L., Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operations.....	16
Gibbs, Richard F., executive secretary, North Carolina American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and chairman, Bicentennial Council of the Original Thirteen States.....	56
Krause, Chester L., Iola, Wis., publisher of Numismatic News.....	82
Lang, George E., member, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and chairman of the Commission's Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals; accompanied by Hugh Hall, deputy executive secretary; Gene Skora, counsel; and Jack Orchard, director of finances.....	13
Louth, William T., president, Medallic Art Co., New York, N.Y.....	97
McClure, Hon. James A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Idaho.....	8
McDonald, George F., chairman, Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission.....	53
Russell, Margo, editor, Coin World Newspaper, and vice chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission's Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals.....	74
Segel, Joseph M., president, the Franklin Mint, Philadelphia, Pa.....	103
Ware, Hon. John H., a Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.....	6

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Adams, Hon. Eva:	
Excerpts from testimony in executive session, April 25, 1969, of Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, on legislation dealing with the striking of commemorative medals.....	21
"National Medals—What Standards Should Be Applied?".....	22
American Mining Congress, letter from J. Allen Overton, Jr., executive vice president, dated June 29, 1971.....	118
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, M. L. Spector, Executive Director:	
Letter dated July 15, 1971, with attachments, re Gibbs and McDonald testimony.....	
ARBC contracts with North Carolina and Rhode Island Bicentennial Commissions.....	71
Press release: Bicentennial Council of the 13 Original States, Williamburg Lodge, Williamburg, Va., June 27, 1971.....	72
Letter to Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan with attached section-by-section explanation of H.R. 7987, dated May 3, 1971.....	3
List of members.....	43

	Page
Brooks, Hon. Mary T.:	
Biography.....	17
Letter with attachment dated September 16, 1970, to Chairman Leonor K. Sullivan, with prepared guidelines for committee use in evaluating bills introduced to authorize the striking of commemorative medals.....	24
List of commemorative medals manufactured by the U.S. Mint for sale by outside organizations.....	25
Prepared statement.....	19
Cerullo, Michael C., Jr., prepared statement.....	91
Dodson, Pat, chairman, Bicentennial Commission of Florida, Pensacola, Fla., letter with attached telegram dated July 30, 1971.....	121
Dickey, Hon. William L., biography.....	16
Franklin Mint, Philadelphia, Pa.:	
Advertisement from the Washington Star, June 27, 1971 (fold-in).....	facing page 118
Brochure illustrating the medallic history of the American Revolution (fold-in).....	facing page 118
Gibbs, Richard F., prepared statement.....	58
Krause, Chester L.:	
"A Plan of Direction for American Revolution Bicentennial Numismatic Activities," a staff study prepared by the editors of Numismatic Weekly, Coins magazine, and Coin Prices.....	85
Prepared statement.....	83
Lang, George E.:	
Biography.....	13
Estimate of ARBC revenues from medals and stamp program.....	49
List of members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.....	43
Pertinent excerpts of the official report of the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals of the Commission.....	44
Prepared statement.....	14
Public Law 89-491, as amended, legislation relating to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.....	46
Relevant excerpts from the Congressional Record of October 14, 1970, stating Chairman Sullivan's recommendation that the official medals not to be limited in quantity, that individual collectors not be denied copies or sets.....	31
Response to question of:	
Chairman Leonor K. Sullivan.....	42, 49
Hon. Fernand J. St Germain.....	40
Hon. Lawrence G. Williams.....	35, 36, 37
Use of word "official" in advertisement of the Franklin Mint/Postmasters of America.....	50
Lewis, Hobart, vice chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, Washington, D.C., letter dated July 26, 1971.....	120
Louth, William T., prepared statement.....	99
McClure, Hon. James A., prepared statement with attached text of H.R. 9408.....	9
McDonald, George F., prepared statement.....	55
Mahoney, Hon. David J., chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, letter to Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan, dated July 29, 1971.....	122
Moss, Edward K., Moss International, Public and Economic Affairs consultants, Washington, D.C., letter dated July 20, 1971.....	122
Postmasters of America, letter to Hon. Mary Brooks, dated July 1, 1971, from Edward V. Dorsey, executive director, National Association of Postmasters of the United States, and Oliver Corona, executive director, National League of Postmasters.....	119
Public Law 89-491, as amended, legislation relating to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.....	46
Riddle, Gene Jones (Mrs. Walter), associate executive director, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission of Texas, Austin, Tex., letter dated July 9, 1971.....	120



v

	Page
Russell, Margo:	
"Distant Drums Come Nearer," editorial from Coin World, May 26, 1971.....	81
"Hobby Gets a Voice," editorial from Coin World, July 7, 1971.....	82
List of Bicentennial-related medals.....	79
Prepared statement.....	76
Segel, Joseph M.:	
Summary of arrangements between the Franklin Mint and Postmasters of America relative to medallic first day cover program....	115
Submission of definition and use of word "official" in advertising of medal and first day cover stamp combination.....	109
Sullivan, Hon. Leonor K.:	
Advertisement of the Franklin Mint, from the Washington Star, June 27, 1971 (fold-in)..... facing page	118
Letter with attachments dated July 15, 1971, to Hon. Mary Brooks, Director of U.S. Mint, requesting official position or statement of policy representing the views of the Bureau of the Mint on standards or guidelines for national medal legislation.....	20
Submission of letter to Hon. David J. Mahoney, chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, from Chairman Wright Patman, Committee on Banking and Currency, dated October 1, 1970.....	52
Ware, Hon. John H., prepared statement.....	6
Whitehurst, Hon. G. William, a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia, letter to Chairman Wright Patman, dated July 26, 1971.....	121
Williams, Hon. Lawrence G., submission of brochure issued by the Franklin Mint, Philadelphia, Pa., illustrating the medallic history of the American Revolution (fold-in)..... facing page	118
Wylie, Hon. Chalmers P., submission of excerpt from the United States Code: section 368 of title 31, pertaining to national medals.....	64

APPENDIX

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:	
Memorandum with attached circulars.....	130
Press releases:	
August 7, 1970.....	123
September 30, 1970.....	123
February 19, 1971.....	126
"Bicentennial Medals Won't Be Out July 4," article from the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., May 30, 1971.....	129
"Collectors Present Position for Bicentennial," article from the Washington Post, October 4, 1970.....	125
Text of H.R. 7374 with attached section-by-section explanation.....	126
"U.S. Is Asked To Change Design of Coin for Bicentennial," article from the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., September 30, 1970.....	124





## TO AUTHORIZE MEDALS COMMEMORATING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1971

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS,  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m., in room 2128, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Sullivan, Gonzalez, Minish, Hanley, Koch, Wylie, Williams, Heckler, and McKinney.

Also present: Representative St Germain.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

This is the first hearing scheduled by the subcommittee since 1963 on legislation dealing with the striking of commemorative national medals by the mint. At that time, we set a policy of encouraging the striking of national medals commemorating major anniversaries of States, cities, national nonprofit organizations, and so on, as an alternative to the previous practice of authorizing special commemorative coins. We have not approved any bills during these past 8 years to authorize commemorative coins, although the pressures have been rather strong upon us to approve several such bills.

When I refer to commemorative coins, I mean coins manufactured not for circulation or for sale by the Treasury to the public, but rather coins made to the order of nonprofit organizations to be sold by those organizations at whatever price they set for them, as a means of raising funds for special observances of various kinds.

During the 1930's there were dozens of such coin issues—usually half dollars minted in small quantities—and these eventually became prized collector items because of their relative scarcity. Today, they all bring fabulous prices in the coin market. I have seen advertisements for some of the 1930-era commemorative half dollars at prices of more than \$200 or \$300 each.

When this subcommittee was formed in 1963 and given jurisdiction over legislation dealing with the mint, as well as over consumer affairs issues within the full committee's jurisdiction, we invited the sponsors of all of the bills then pending proposing commemorative coins, as well as those proposing the authorization of commemorative medals, to attend a hearing at which we discussed the pros and cons of commemorative coins versus medals.

Following that hearing, we announced a general policy of prompt and sympathetic consideration for bills proposing commemorative



medals, providing such medals would be made at absolutely no cost to the mint, and we said we would not approve any bills for commemorative coins.

And since that time, we have approved about 30 bills for commemorative national medals, nearly all of which were enacted. Usually, they have been completely noncontroversial, and were handled on an informal basis by polling the members of the subcommittee by mail to make sure no member had any objection to such a bill being called up in the full committee for approval by unanimous consent. All of them subsequently passed the House on the Consent Calendar, or, if there were a time element involved, under suspension of the rules.

However, after we had approved a Senate bill several years ago authorizing the striking of national medals commemorating the 200th anniversary of Dartmouth College, some of the private manufacturers of commemorative medals began to have misgivings about Government competition in a field which the private manufacturers of medallions had been serving. These misgivings increased last year when a bill was introduced and subsequently enacted authorizing medals commemorating the 100th anniversary of Ohio Northern University. As a result of complaints from the private sector, we announced in reference to the Ohio Northern bill that, thereafter, we would adopt and follow stricter guidelines in determining what is and what is not an event or anniversary of such clear national interest and significance to warrant the striking of national medals.

We asked the Bureau of the Mint to provide for our consideration what it would regard as reasonable guidelines in developing such a policy determination and Mrs. Brooks today includes with her statement the gist of the guidelines the Bureau has suggested to us.

I also asked her to give us a complete catalog of all of the commemorative medals authorized by the Congress for sale by nonprofit organizations—the number authorized, the number actually produced, the sizes in each instance, the alloys used, and, if that information could be ascertained, the prices at which they were sold. That list is also attached to Mrs. Brooks' statement and will be made part of the record following her testimony. We are glad to have this catalog and to make it available to the public in this manner.

The list she has prepared also contains several Treasury list medals we had authorized—medals sold not by private nonprofit organizations but by the Bureau of the Mint itself. One such list medal marked the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service under a bill introduced by Chairman Patman of the full committee; the other list medal in the group commemorates the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Secret Service, under a bill I was happy to sponsor as subcommittee chairman. All of the rest of the medals listed in the catalog Mrs. Brooks has prepared were sold or distributed free by sponsoring organizations, except for a few which were authorized but never manufactured.

I have taken the time to give this background this morning because, as I indicated to the members in a notice sent last week, our purpose this morning is not only to hear testimony on H.R. 7987, authorizing the striking of medals for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, but also to review the whole policy of approving commemorative medals bills.



I don't think anyone here—including witnesses we have invited from the private medallic manufacturing industry—would question the validity of the issuance of national medals for an official Government agency, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, to mark the 200th birthday of our Nation. But I do think the gentlemen we have invited from the private sector have a right to be heard on the policy aspects of medals production by the mint, and that is one of the main reasons this hearing was scheduled. We will also hear from several representatives of the State bicentennial commissions, and from executives of the two largest publications in the numismatic field.

Before we call our first witness I want to insert in the hearing record at this point the text of H.R. 7987, along with a section-by-section analysis submitted by the administration in explanation of this bill, and a copy of the Treasury report of the bill.

(The text of H.R. 7987, the section-by-section analysis of the bill submitted by the Commission, and a copy of the Treasury report on the bill follow:)

[H.R. 7987, 92d Cong., first sess., introduced by Mr. Patman, Mrs. Sullivan, and Mr. Widnall, on May 3, 1971]

A BILL To provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of the United States and the historic events preceding and associated with the American Revolution, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to strike medals of suitable sizes and metals, each with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission") subject to the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 2. A national medal shall be struck commemorating the year 1776 and its significance to American independence. In addition to the national medal, a maximum of thirteen medals each of a different design may be struck to commemorate specific historical events of great importance, recognized nationally as milestones in the continuing progress of the United States of America toward life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall strike and furnish to the Commission such quantities of medals as may be necessary, with a minimum order of two thousand medals of each design or size. They shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission, but no medals may be made after December 31, 1983.

SEC. 4. The medals authorized under this Act are national medals within the meaning of section 3851 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 5. The medals shall be furnished by the Secretary at a price equal to the cost of the manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

---

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1971.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reference to the draft bill submitted to you jointly by ARBC and Mint representatives for the striking of commemorative medals by the U.S. Mint. The draft bill provides for the striking of a national medal, and a maximum of thirteen special commemorative medals, each of a different design to commemorate specific events of great importance to the historical development of the United States.

The section-by-section explanation attached to the draft bill indicates that these special commemorative medals are intended to be used in conjunction with companion commemorative stamps (both relating to the same event) and contained



in a specially designed transparent package. These medal-stamp combinations are called philatelic-numismatic commemoratives (PNC). The explanation further states that the first such combination is planned for 1971.

The ARBC had planned in conjunction with the Mint and Postal Service a first PNC in the series to be available about July 4, 1971. Unfortunately, however, the delay in the submission of the draft bill will preclude the 1971 PNC. The stamp intended to be used in the combination will be issued on or about July 4. The ARBC and the Mint now propose to issue the first of the thirteen special commemorative medals authorized in the bill as soon as possible in 1971 after enactment of the legislation independent of the commemorative stamp. It is planned to begin the PNC series in 1972 with an appropriate stamp-medal combination.

Sincerely yours,

M. L. SPECTOR, *Executive Director.*

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

##### BACKGROUND

Throughout history it has been the practice of Governments to strike commemorative medals in celebration of and to perpetuate historic occasions and events. The United States government has, through the U.S. Mint, struck such medals on numerous occasions, including the Centennial anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

In enacting PL 89-491 which established the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, the Congress directed the Commission to recommend an overall program for commemorating the Bicentennial of the American Revolution including the issuance of commemorative medals.

Accordingly, the Commission convened an Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals composed of professional numismatists to develop recommendations for Bicentennial numismatic commemorative programs.

The Panel's recommendations regarding a commemorative medals program were adopted by the Commission.

The recommendations are that:

A *national medal* be struck by the U.S. Mint which would be singularly identifiable in both obverse and reverse design as the official national medal commemorating the Bicentennial.

A series of not less than 6 and not more than 13 appropriate commemorative medals be struck by the U.S. Mint, to be issued annually with a related commemorative stamp, having a first date of issue cancellation, as a *philatelic-numismatic combination*.

An *awards medal* be struck by a private mint as a Commission presentation piece in recognition of outstanding service, leadership or support of Bicentennial programs.

A *State medal* authorized by each State be struck by private mints in cooperation with the Commission to assure uniform size, composition and design to result in an official matching set of medals of all the States.

The Commission believes that this comprehensive program will result in a variety of official national and State commemorative medals to satisfy the needs of the general public and collectors and to perpetuate the Bicentennial by means of such historic mementoes.

The draft bill authorizes two kinds of medals recommended by the Commission for striking by the U.S. Mint. That is, the national medal, and the medals for the philatelic-numismatic combination series. The State medals will, of course, have to be authorized in appropriate State legislation. Also, since the awards medal is to be struck by private mints, no Federal authorizing legislation is necessary.

##### SECTION 1

This Section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike the medals authorized in Section 2 of the Bill. The designs, sizes, and metals will be determined by the Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

##### SECTION 2

This Section authorizes the striking of a national medal commemorating 1976 as the 200th anniversary of American independence. The medal, in a design approved by the Commission and with concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, will be struck in uniform sizes and of common and precious metals. In order



that sufficient numbers of medals are produced, the striking and stockpiling by the Mint will begin a sufficient period of time prior to 1976. Distribution of the medals will probably begin no earlier than July 4, 1975, and may end on or before December 31, 1983. Various outlets will be established for widest possible distribution of the medals.

This Section also authorizes the striking of a maximum of thirteen medals (one for each year 1971 to 1983; or a minimum of six, one for each year 1971 to 1976) to create philatelic-numismatic commemoratives, a unique combination of a commemorative stamp and a commemorative medal (usually representing one specific event) affixed together in a specially designed envelope which is postmarked and cancelled on the eventful date at a pertinent historical location. The philatelic-numismatic combination was chosen as a meaningful and tangible method to perpetuate the Bicentennial era since it can portray historic characters and events in contemporary fashion for retention as official historical mementoes.

It is expected that the U.S. Mint will produce the commemorative medals, the U.S. Postal Service will produce commemorative stamps, and a private corporation on contract will package and distribute the philatelic-numismatic commemorative packages in the name of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

#### SECTION 3

This Section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to fill Commission requests for the various medals. Generally, medal production will be based on estimates of demand.

The first philatelic-numismatic commemoratives are planned for distribution on July 4, 1971. Follow-up PNC's may be distributed on each subsequent Independence Day or a day of special significance to the realization of American independence.

#### SECTION 4

This Section stipulates that the medals authorized by the Bill are national medals. Such official designation enhances their value as historic mementoes.

#### SECTION 5

This Section provides that the Commission will receive the medals at cost from the Mint. The Commission plans to make the medals available to the general public at a reasonable price.

The national medal will be sold in both common and precious metals and large and small sizes, ranging, for example, from a small 1 5/16 inch bronze, to a 3 inch platinum medal.

The philatelic-numismatic commemoratives, all of a uniform size and composition should be of interest both to stamp and medal collectors and to the general public for their uniqueness and historic value.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1971.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 7987, "To provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution."

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to strike (1) medals of suitable sizes and metals, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary, and (2) a national medal commemorating the year 1776. It would also authorize the striking of a maximum of thirteen medals each of a different design to commemorate specific historical events of great importance. The bill would direct the Secretary to furnish to the Commission such quantities of medals as may be necessary with a minimum order of 2,000 medals of each design or size. It would provide that no medals may be made after December 31, 1983 and that the medals shall

be furnished at a price equal to the cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

The Department would have no objection to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Department has been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this report to your Committee.

Sincerely yours,

ROY T. ENGLERT,  
*Acting General Counsel.*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. This bill, H.R. 7987, is an administrative measure. It was jointly introduced by Chairman Patman of the full committee, by me as chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction, and by Representative Widnall as the ranking minority member of the full committee.

I sincerely hope that we can complete this hearing this morning and hear all of the scheduled witnesses, and also have time for extensive questioning. This will be achievable if the witnesses will please make brief oral summaries of their prepared statements rather than reading them verbatim. Their entire statements will be made a part of the record in all instances.

But it would save time if they make brief oral summaries of their statements. Most of the witnesses have complied with our request for advance copies of their prepared statements, and all of those submitted were distributed to the members of the subcommittee yesterday afternoon in the hope that they would read them before coming to the hearing.

As a courtesy to any Members of Congress who are present and who wish to submit statements for the hearing record, or briefly give oral testimony, it is customary to call on them first.

I believe Congressman McClure, who introduced the bill H.R. 9408 last Thursday, wishes to be heard.

Are there any other Members of Congress here now who wish to testify or submit statements, particularly any of the House Members who serve on the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission? There are no House Members present who serve on the commission, but I see Congressman Ware, who indicated he wanted to file a statement.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN H. WARE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WARE. Good morning, Madam Chairman. I am Congressman Ware.

In accordance with the arrangement made with your staff, I will merely submit a prepared statement.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We will make it a part of the record at this point.  
(The prepared statement of Mr. Ware follows:)

#### PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN H. WARE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA ON H.R. 7987

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present this statement to the distinguished Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs. I am submitting this as a statement for the record. In order to save the time of your subcommittee, I have not requested that I appear in person.



I support the purpose of H.R. 7987. I am suggesting that it be amended, however, as to the method by which the purpose will be carried out.

H.R. 7987 which provides for the striking of medals in commemoration of the American Revolution—is one of some considerable importance to posterity, touching as it does upon the spiritual nature of American independence.

Commenting last year upon this very aspect of our Country's 200th anniversary, President Nixon observed that "somewhere along the line many of us perhaps have forgotten that spiritual quality. Americans need to be reminded of it. Perhaps we all have to discover it: why we are here; what we mean to the world."

I agree with the President, and in so doing, I also desire to support this measure—H.R. 7987—with certain revisions—that the minting of medals of historical significance will emphasize through their lasting quality, the message of this august occasion—the bicentennial.

It is the hope of the American Bicentennial Commission that 1976 will be a year of true significance; as a target for corrective goals; as a time for recommitment for goals unachieved; as a brief moment in time when we pause and investigate our heritage, with genuine concern. In keeping with these emphatic purposes, it would seem to me entirely fitting that medals be struck, in honor of our Revolutionary leaders—medals that shall long survive, to the benefit of our National traditions.

Nor should we overlook the growing influence in America of numismatics—the science which treats of coins, their origin and technique, their history, mythology and art, as a matter of the greatest interest and a major form of environment. Coin collecting is becoming one of the outstanding hobbies in the Country and medals of the kind proposed in this measure would add to the enjoyment of thousands.

We should recognize the international aspect as well, because the impact of the American Revolution on the rest of the world was electric, bringing many from overseas to our shores, to join in the struggle for democracy. The gallant performances of Lafayette, Pulaski, Kosciuszko and von Steuben—to name only a few—was vital to our interests. Many of their countrymen retain an interest in our Revolutionary cause, in consequence of their association with it. The minting of coins in reference to their achievement is certain of attracting international acclaim.

H.R. 7987 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to strike suitable medals as may be determined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and subject to the approval of the Secretary.

It occurs to me that it is appropriate that the National medal commemorating American independence in 1776 shall be struck by the Secretary. However, I am most hopeful that my colleagues will agree with me that other appropriate medals shall be struck by private mints which operate as business enterprises in this country. This most certainly is not intended as any reflection on the United States mint.

It seems to me most important that tax-paying private enterprise shall whenever possible be called upon to provide goods and services to the Federal government. It is my belief that Government should not compete with private enterprise. Efforts have been made in the past indeed to divorce the Federal government from its business activities. This has occurred all too infrequently. There have, however, been some striking examples of what has occurred in such instances.

The Federal government operated the Inland Waterways Corporation on the Mississippi River for a number of years. The Corporation operated at a deficit each year. In the 1950s the Inland Waterways Corporation was sold to the Federal Barge Company, a private independent enterprise. In brief, the results of that operation have been that the Federal Barge Company has reduced the rates to its customers and paid all of the fees and taxes (whereas the Inland Waterways Corporation paid none of these) to local and State government in the territory in which it operates. Furthermore, it has annually paid corporate net income taxes to the Federal government. In addition, it entered into a contract with an appropriate labor union which represents its operating employees.

I am not suggesting that private mints shall coin United States currency. I do advocate, however, that H.R. 7987 shall be amended so that the private mints in the United States shall have an opportunity to furnish such medals as may be desired, other than the National medal, which will be used to commemorate the Bicentennial of the birth of the United States of America, the world's outstanding example of the free enterprise system.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Congressman McClure.

Mr. McCLURE. Madam Chairman, I would like to make a statement when recognized for that purpose.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Will you sit down at the witness table, and we will hear you first.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES A. McCLURE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN  
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO**

Mr. McCLURE. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

I have submitted the statement for the record, and I will summarize it briefly from that.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If you please.

Mr. McCLURE. My proposal, which has been introduced as H.R. 9408, differs from the other measure before this committee in a couple of major respects so far as the medal series is concerned.

First of all, it goes beyond the recommendations of the Bicentennial Commission by providing that the State medal series be incorporated into the national series. This is done for a couple of reasons:

First of all, to enhance their prestige. I hope that it would enhance the sale of those medals if they are given legislative recognition.

In the same vein, the awards medal which is proposed by the Bicentennial Commission is recognized by the legislation. You will note it would not be produced by the U.S. Mint. This is for the same reason as the other commemorative medal section.

The more important aspect or difference is that my bill proposes that the metallic content be fixed by legislation rather than with no reference other than to administrative discretion as is proposed by the administration bill.

I think this is important for a number of reasons, but primarily because actual practice has indicated the acceptance and desirability of minting of medals with prestige value if they are minted of silver. So my bill does provide that the medals be of four kinds: A large medal and a small replica in both bronze and in 0.925 fine silver. It also gives the administration the authority to issue in gold if they should so desire. But some comment has been made that we should issue them in bronze or in platinum. I think the suggestion that the 3-inch awards medal be in platinum is not a very realistic suggestion, because of the cost of platinum and the shortage of the supply and the fact that we do import most of the platinum.

A 3-inch medal of platinum would require a sales price of \$2,000 to \$2,500 just because of the value of the metal itself, and even the private mints haven't been able to make a success of that kind of an operation.

There is another section in my bill which proposes the issuance of a commemorative dollar in 1976 in exactly the same composition and type as the Eisenhower silver dollar was authorized by legislation last year.

These, I think, are the major differences between the administration proposal and mine. I really honestly believe that if this is to be a successful series of medals, it must have the public acceptance that silver denotes, and the kind of respect for our national heritage and tradition which silver implies as a precious metal—as one of the basic



metals for coinage that was utilized by this foundling Nation 200 years ago. I think it is an appropriate commemoration of that event.

(The prepared statement of Mr. McClure and a copy of H.R. 9408 follow:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES A. MCCLURE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS  
FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

It is always an honor to appear before the House Banking and Currency Committee, but it is doubly so when the matter at hand is commemoration of our national heritage.

I join you in saluting the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Its recommendations for a series of medallions are entirely appropriate and in keeping with the spirit of the occasion. The bill that I have introduced, H.R. 9408, takes the Commission's suggestions, enlarges upon them and carries them, I think, to a more logical end.

Like the other measures before you, my bill provides for a National Medal and it authorizes a maximum of thirteen medals commemorating a significant milestone out of the American past.

The Commission originated the concept of an Awards Medal to be given to those individuals whose contributions to the success of the Bicentennial are considered outstanding. I like that idea very much and have provided for it in my bill.

We know that the States plan to issue medallions of their own, and as an inducement, H.R. 9408 would recognize those medals as part of the official Bicentennial program. I think it is important to remember that collectors prefer to buy a complete series. Indeed, sales of all medallions issued by the Government will be enhanced if we give official recognition to those produced by the States.

There is another consideration which bears upon the desirability of these medals and that is their composition. It is told to me by people at the Treasury Department that some will be minted in bronze, some will be of German silver and some will be platinum. Bronze is a traditional metal for such purposes, and I have no quarrel with its inclusion here. German silver, on the other hand, is pot metal. If it were salable, private mints would have been using it long ago. And if private mints cannot justify its use, how can we expect the Federal Government to do so?

Platinum is equally ridiculous. It is in short supply, and its cost enormous. So, I made a few inquiries about its use in medals from respected and knowledgeable sources. The Franklin Mint in Philadelphia, for example, has tried using platinum from time to time, and never have they been able to charge less than a thousand dollars for the finished product. Numismatic News figures that a 3-inch platinum bicentennial medallion would cost somewhere between two thousand and two thousand five hundred dollars apiece.

Throughout history silver and gold have been the medals of art. Other metals offered durability; others were merely inexpensive. But only silver and gold could combine the best of all worlds—beauty as well as durability and reasonable cost.

I know of no other way to supply a prestige medal at a price acceptable to the average American than through the use of silver. We know that the Bicentennial Commission originally wanted the medallions to contain silver because the founding fathers placed great value in silver and gold coins at the time of the Nation's founding. Trade publications also have editorialized in behalf of silver bicentennial medallions, and we have proof of the metal's continued acceptance by the average American because of the unprecedented demand for the Eisenhower dollar.

Most Americans want a series of prestige bicentennial medallions, but they want them to be within reach of their pocketbooks. That is why my bill authorizes that each medal, except the Awards Medal, is to be minted in two medals, one silver and one bronze. Each would come in two sizes—a larger, prestigious medal and a smaller, more inexpensive facsimile. The Secretary of the Treasury would have the option of producing a third series in gold, if he desires to do so.

The Awards medal would be struck in .925 fine silver only. It and the state medals would be produced by private mints.

As a matter of fact, I would have no objection to farming out all of these medals to private mints if they can handle it and it meets with the Committee's approval. After all, we are commemorating 200 years in which free enterprise built this country into the most powerful nation in history. The role of private industry should be equally as important as the Government's in celebrating the occasion.

Finally, I have added an additional section authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a special coin dollar, the composition of which would be identical with that of the Eisenhower silver dollar. The quantity would be left to the discretion of the Secretary, as would the design, provided, of course, that it was in keeping with the spirit of the Bicentennial.

Mrs. Brooks, the Director of the Mint, has estimated that the Treasury will realize a profit of many, many millions from production of the Eisenhower silver dollars. The Silver Institute puts it at a more modest figure but suffice to say, a handsome profit is there just the same. And I recall that collectors have told me that while they will collect medals as readily as coins, other Americans are more prone to purchase a coin *dollar* as a souvenir or a gift for a loved one. So, I would not want this Committee to dismiss out of hand the profit that can be derived from the production of a prestige coin along with the medallions.

Back in the days when the Eisenhower silver dollar legislation was before the Congress, I was privileged to have as an ally in that struggle the remarkable Senator from Colorado, Mr. Dominick. It was therefore a source of deep personal pride to learn that Mr. Dominick had introduced in the Senate yesterday a bill similar to my own. I'm sure that if he were appearing before this panel today he would join me in urging that the Committee honor America's past through the use of those metals which helped make that past worth remembering. The Founding Fathers, in carving a nation out of a wilderness, did so much with so little. What a shame it would be to find that affluent America would now do so little with so much.

[H.R. 9408, 92d Cong., first sess., introduced by Mr. McClure on June 24, 1971]

**A BILL To provide for the striking of medals and \$1 pieces in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of the United States and the historic events preceding and associated with the American Revolution, there is hereby authorized to be struck medals of suitable sizes, each with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission"), subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary"), which shall be known as the United States Bicentennial medal series (hereafter referred to as the "series").

Sec. 2. (A) A national medal shall be struck commemorating the year 1776 and its significance to American independence.

(B) An awards medal may be struck as a Commission presentation piece in recognition of outstanding service, leadership, or support of bicentennial programs.

(C) A maximum of thirteen medals each of a different design may be struck to commemorate specific historical events of great importance, recognized nationally as milestones in the continuing progress of the United States of America toward life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

(D) Each State may cause to be struck and issued a medal subject to the approval of the Commission and the Secretary.

Sec. 3. Each medal with the exception of the awards medal shall be of four or more varieties: One shall be struck in .925 fine silver, one shall be struck in bronze, and two shall be struck in .925 fine silver and bronze respectively and be of such size so as to be an inexpensive facsimile of the more costly medals authorized under this Act. The awards medal shall be struck in .925 fine silver and be of only one size which shall be determined by the Commission. In addition, the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary, may direct that any of the medals authorized in section 2 be struck in gold.

Sec. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed to strike the national medal authorized in section 2(A) and the commemorative medals authorized in section 2(C) of this Act. The awards medal authorized in section 2(B) and the State medals authorized in section 2(D) of this Act shall be struck by private mints.



SEC. 5. The Secretary shall strike and furnish to the Commission such quantities of national medals and commemorative medals as may be necessary, with a minimum order of two thousand medals of each design and size. They shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission, but no medals may be made after December 31, 1983. The medals shall be furnished by the Secretary at a price equal to the cost of the manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 6. The medals authorized under section 2 (A) and (C) of this Act are national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the third sentence of section 3510 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 276) and in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the United States, the Secretary shall cause to be minted and issued, in such limited quantity as he determines appropriate, \$1 pieces which shall have—

(A) a diameter of 1.500 inches;

(B) a cladding of an alloy of eight hundred parts of silver and two hundred parts of copper; and

(C) a core of an alloy of silver and copper such that the whole coin weighs 24.592 grams and contains 9.837 grams of silver and 14.755 grams of copper. The coins authorized under this section shall be of such design as the Secretary determines to be appropriate after consultation with the Commission.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Congressman.

Your bill became available just over the weekend and I believe it is essentially the same as H.R. 7987 except—let's see if I have summarized it correctly—except that you specify that 25 percent of each variety of medal manufactured for the Bicentennial Commemoration Commission be made of almost pure silver; that 25 percent be made of bronze; and that the remaining 50 percent be of a reduced size, half of them of nearly pure silver and the other half of bronze.

Mr. McCURE. With one small variation, that is correct. I didn't provide the percentage. I just said that there shall be four varieties, and the percentage of those varieties could vary. But it is intended that there be a large medal and a facsimile medal in both metals.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Then your bill, as you say, calls for the minting of an unspecified but limited quantity of bicentennial silver dollars. We did not intend to go into the coinage aspects of the bicentennial today, because I understand that the Treasury Department and the administration have not yet developed their own position on bicentennial coinage.

But, we would of course, be glad to consider the other things that you propose, to the extent that they differ from those provided in the administration bill, H.R. 7987. Your comments on proposed new coins are, of course, of interest to us but that would be outside the scope of this hearing this morning.

Mr. McCURE. I appreciate that comment, Madam Chairman.

I might just mention that Senator Dominick has introduced a bill similar to mine with the exception of the section dealing with the bicentennial commemorative dollar.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Fine. Are there any questions?

Mr. Minish.

Mr. MINISH. No.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to thank Congressman McCure for appearing here this morning.

In the fifth paragraph of your statement you state: "We know that the States plan to issue medallions of their own." And you would recommend that the series be part of the official bicentennial program.

How do you intend to have produced the medals you are talking about here?

Mr. McCLURE. My bill provides that the national medal and the not to exceed 13 commemorative medals would be produced by the U.S. Mint. The State medals and the award medals would be produced by private mints.

I have also indicated that I have no objection if this committee should decide to have it all done in private mintage. But I am sure that the administration has a strong position on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the very next paragraph you say: "There is another consideration which bears upon the desirability of these medals, and that is composition." Then you go on to say: "It is told to me by people at the Treasury Department that some will be minted in bronze, some will be of German silver, and some will be of platinum." Were you referring here to the medals that are proposed to be produced by the U.S. Mint?

Mr. McCLURE. Yes, I am, except the platinum medal, which I think it was suggested, in explanation of the bill when introduced by the Senate, that it was proposed that the award medal which will be produced by a private mint will be of platinum or could be of platinum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What you are really saying here is that H.R. 7987 makes no reference to the metals that will be used in the production of these commemorative medals?

Mr. McCLURE. The only reference is that the metal or metallic content shall be at the discretion of the administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But you say that the people in the Treasury Department told you that some will be of bronze and some will be of German silver?

Mr. McCLURE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And others of platinum?

Mr. McCLURE. That is the information which has come to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Fine. Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. HECKLER. No questions.

I want to thank the Congressman for his very helpful testimony.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. McKinney.

Mr. McKINNEY. No questions.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. McClure.

The next witnesses represent the administration. We have Mr. George E. Lang, member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and Chairman of the Commission's Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals; Mr. William L. Dickey, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury—we understood yesterday that you weren't going to come, Mr. Dickey, but I am glad that you were able to make it—and Mrs. Mary Brooks, Director of the Mint, which would produce the medals called for in H.R. 7987 and be reimbursed by the Commission for all costs.

We have your full statements which we will include in the printed record. If you will summarize your testimony, I think then we will be able to get in some questions.

But first, we want to place in the record the biographical sketch of Mr. Lang, which the Commission staff has provided, and following



your oral statement, Mr. Lang, we will insert the biographical sketch of Mr. Dickey and then of Mrs. Brooks.

So, will you proceed, Mr. Lang.

**STATEMENT OF GEORGE E. LANG, MEMBER, AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION'S ADVISORY PANEL ON COINS AND MEDALS; ACCOMPANIED BY HUGH HALL, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR; GENE SKORA, GENERAL COUNSEL; AND JACK ORCHARD, DIRECTOR OF FINANCES**

(The biographical sketch of Mr. Lang follows:)

**BIOGRAPHY OF GEORGE E. LANG**

Since his arrival in the United States, George E. Lang has been assistant banquet manager for the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, vice-president for the Brass Rail Organization and since 1960 a corporate vice-president with Restaurant Associate Industries, Inc.

As project director for Restaurant Associates, he created and opened a variety of facilities which included the Tower Suite atop the Time-Life Building and the recently opened Fountain Cafe in Central Park. He was also executive director of The Four Seasons restaurant. A specialist in large scale, off-premises catering, Mr. Lang has catered parties for as many as ten thousand persons.

Born in 1924 in Hungary, Mr. Lang was educated there as well as in Austria and Italy. He has worked on the American Heritage *History of American Cooking* and is currently writing a history of Hungarian cuisine from the fifth century to the present. In addition to serving as consulting editor for the Time-Life *Foods of the World* cookbook series, Mr. Lang, at the request of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, is writing its new entries on "gastronomy" and "restaurants".

Update/May 19, 1971—Head of The George Lang Corporation: merchandising consultant to Marriott's three operating groups—hotels, restaurants, and airline catering. He will also create restaurants for Loews Hotels overseas, beginning with the new inn being built in Hamburg.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. First, Mr. Lang, would you introduce the people who have accompanied you from the Commission.

Mr. LANG. Thank you. I am accompanied by the Deputy Executive Director of the ARBC, Hugh Hall; General Counsel Gene Skora; and the director of finances, Jack Orchard.

I would like to thank you, Madam Chairman, and the committee members for the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and testify on the bill H.R. 7987, to authorize the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the United States of America.

We have submitted a statement which I think you have received, and in a very brief summary I would like to tell you that the Commission authorized a Subcommittee on Coins and Medals, composed of a great variety of experts well known in the professional field of numismatics. We have created a subcommittee which, I think, is distinguished by any standards, and which is representative of both the private collector's field, the Smithsonian Institution, the American Numismatic Association, and a great variety of other organizations. We held meetings and hearings—including open hearings—for approximately 1 year. We have had five interim reports, and as a result the subcommittee submitted recommendations to the executive committee of the ARBC, which accepted it as it was recommended.

In turn, the executive committee brought it to the full Commission, which accepted it in toto, and almost unanimously.

Our suggestion, basically, in connection with the medals include, first of all, a national medal to be struck by the U.S. Mint which would be singularly identifiable in both obverse and reverse design, as the official national medal commemorating the bicentennial.

Furthermore, the ARBC proposal contains a series of not less than six and not more than 13 appropriate commemorative medals combined, these medals to be struck by the U.S. Mint, and these to be combined with related commemorative stamps having the first day of issuance cancellation, which is generally called a philatelic-numismatic combination.

This will be combined with an appropriate vignette, historical documents perhaps in facsimile form, to be prepared under the direction of the historians on the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

The third medal we suggested was an award medal to be struck by a private mint as a Commission presentation piece in recognition of outstanding service, leadership or support of bicentennial programs.

The fourth part was for State commemorative medals authorized by each State and to be struck by private mints.

Finally, I would like to add that the Commission believes that its program as it stands in front of you, Madam Chairman and committee members, is comprehensive as far as the commemorative medals program is concerned, and I think would satisfy the needs of the general public, and the collectors, and would perpetuate the bicentennial by means of truly important and authentic historical mementos.

We feel the program is completely balanced between collectors and the public, and between private enterprise and the U.S. Mint. We do feel that the prestige of the Government's facilities and the versatility of the private enterprise combined would actually serve the public needs in the best possible manner.

Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you. Mr. Lang.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Lang follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GEORGE E. LANG, ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION, AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION'S ADVISORY PANEL ON COINS AND MEDALS

Madam Chairman, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs to testify on H.R. 7987, a bill to authorize the striking of medals in commemoration of the American Revolution Bicentennial.

I am appearing today on behalf of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission as a member of the Commission and as the Chairman of the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals established by the Commission.

As such, I am a private citizen contributing my services to the Bicentennial effort. I do this, Madam Chairman, in the deep-seated belief that the two hundredth birthday of the oldest continuing Republic on the face of the earth is truly an occasion both for rejoicing and solemn rededication. It is an occasion to emphasize the commitment of the Spirit of America.

It should not be an occasion for platitudes and fireworks, but rather an opportunity to re-evaluate the American dream, and an effort to bring it to reality.

One of the first steps should be to give all Americans an awareness of the Bicentennial commemoration and to provide them with an heirloom to pass down to their children as a physical legacy of the Bicentennial. This we propose to do by means of official commemorative medals. The purpose of the bill before



the Subcommittee today would authorize the U.S. Mint to strike a maximum of fourteen such national medals carrying appropriate designs.

As the Subcommittee is aware, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was established by Joint Resolution of the 89th Congress on July 4, 1966, to plan, encourage, develop and coordinate the commemoration of the American Revolution Bicentennial. That law directed the Commission to prepare an overall program for commemorating the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, to include activities such as the issuance of commemorative coins and medals.

The Commission established an Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals to provide research, professional opinion, and recommendations on the role of coins and medals in perpetuating the Bicentennial.

The Panel was asked to determine broad guidelines for Bicentennial numismatic commemorative programs, to be submitted to the full Commission for use in developing its recommendations to the President and the Congress regarding coins and medals.

Panel membership includes distinguished private and Government representatives who are active in the commemorative coins and medals field. Membership includes numismatists in the Division of Numismatics of the Smithsonian, editors of numismatic publications and Government representatives, including the Director of the U.S. Mint.

I am proud to say, Madam Chairman, that this is an extraordinary Panel and includes perhaps the most eminent aggregation of numismatic talent ever assembled in one group. (A list of such Panel members appears at the end of this statement.)

I wish to point out that, as a considered policy decision of the Commission, no Panel members are in the business of producing, distributing or selling commemorative coins or medals. However, the Panel solicited the views of such business interests. For example, during a two-day plenary meeting of the Panel, position papers were presented by representatives of the American Numismatic Association, the Franklin Mint, the Medallie Art Company, Paramount International Coin Corporation, and others. Such views were carefully considered by the Panel in reaching its recommendations.

Following months of deliberation, the Panel submitted its recommendations to the full Commission which accepted them *en toto*. Some of the recommendations require congressional action, others do not.

The commemorative medals' recommendations that require congressional action are incorporated in H.R. 7987, which was submitted by the Administration and is the subject for this hearing. The Commission's recommendations which are incorporated in H.R. 7987 are:

That a *National Bicentennial Medal* be struck by the U.S. Mint. Such a medal would be singularly identifiable in both obverse and reverse design as the official national medal commemorating the Bicentennial.

The specially designed commemorative medals be struck by the U.S. Mint and issued annually for sale to the public for a period of not less than six and not more than thirteen years. Such commemorative medal would be combined with a special commemorative stamp (both representing the same event) in a specially designed envelope which is postmarked and cancelled on the eventful date at a pertinent, historical location. Such medal-stamp combinations are called Philatelic-Numismatic Commemoratives.

Philatelic-numismatic commemoratives are a fairly new development which should have appeal both to medal collectors as well as stamp collectors. The combination of a well-designed medal, a companion stamp, a first day cover, and an explanatory historical vignette creates a handsome and meaningful historical memento that should promote general interest in the Bicentennial.

Recommendations which do not require legislative action are:

That an *Awards Medal* be created by the Commission, struck by private industry in very limited quantities and made of precious metals as a presentation piece in recognition of meritorious service.

That the State Bicentennial Commissions each establish a *State Medal* for distribution to the public and that their medals be struck by private organizations. The Commission is prepared to assist in developing uniform standards for the production of such a State Medal for 1976. The Commission can assist in developing overall size, composition, and design of each State Medal so that the public may have the opportunity of acquiring one official, uniform set.

Summarizing the total commemorative medals program, the Mint will strike only a National Medal to be available in 1976 and a series of from six to thirteen medals to be issued in conjunction with a companion commemorative stamp.

The private sector will strike an Award Medal for the Commission, all 50 State medals in a uniform set, and all other medals for the States, localities and private groups.

This "mix" of a maximum of fourteen U.S. Mint-struck medals and a minimum of fifty-one private-struck medals should result in sufficient commemorative medals to create an awareness of the Bicentennial in the general public, to satisfy collectors, and to perpetuate the Bicentennial by means of such historic mementoes. At the same time, the program is carefully balanced to take into account the interests of the public, the collectors, private industry, and the U.S. Government. As a further example of this balance, the Commission intends to use the private sector on a competitive basis to handle all facets (order taking, packaging, shipping, etc.) other than the striking of the commemorative medals.

I wish to point out that the Commission's paramount interest is in the public participation in the Bicentennial rather than the profits that may accrue to private mints, speculators, or to the Commission itself. The Commission does anticipate that it will derive net revenues from the sale of U.S. Mint-struck medals. However, the Commission's aim is the broadest possible citizen participation consistent with a fair return to the Government.

As you are aware, Madam Chairman, Representative Wright Patman, Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has written to Chairman David J. Mahoney of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission that the observance of the 200th anniversary of the formation of the United States of America will be an event of such great significance to the people of our country that it should certainly be commemorated numismatically in a form reflective of the importance of the occasion. Chairman Patman further stated his opinion that "numismatic material created by the Bicentennial Commission as part of this great national observance should be approved by the Congress and should be made in the Mint . . . as national medals, either to be sold directly to the public by the Mint or by the Bicentennial Commission in a manner which will assure opportunity to every citizen to obtain copies or sets of all issues." We believe that H.R. 7987 will accomplish such objectives.

Revenues resulting from sales will be available to the Commission, to the extent authorized by law and as determined by Commission policy, for funding appropriate Bicentennial programs, including programs undertaken by the several States as well as by local communities and patriotic and service organizations. As you know, the Commission membership includes four Senators and four Congressmen who will participate in the development of Commission policy on revenues and oversee its implementation.

I wish to thank you, Madam Chairman, and the Subcommittee for the opportunity to present this statement in support of H.R. 7987. We hope that the Commission's numismatic program and proposed implementation meets with your approval and that the bill will be approved.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Dickey, do you have a statement?

Mr. DICKEY. Madam Chairman, I have a very brief statement which I would like to read for the record.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. You may proceed.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM L. DICKEY, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FOR ENFORCEMENT AND OPERATIONS

(The biography of Mr. Dickey follows:)

##### BIOGRAPHY OF HON. WILLIAM L. DICKEY, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

On November 19, 1969, Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy appointed William L. Dickey as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Operations.

Mr. Dickey is from Sioux Falls, South Dakota. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Augustana College, Sioux Falls, in 1957, and a Juris Doctor degree from George Washington University School of Law in 1962.

Since receiving his Juris Doctor degree, Mr. Dickey has practiced law both in Washington, D.C. and South Dakota. Mr. Dickey's career includes public



service as Assistant Professor of Law at the University of South Dakota 1962-63 and as Minority Counsel for the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations during 1963 and 1964. While practicing law in his home state, Mr. Dickey has also served as Special Assistant Attorney General for the State of South Dakota and in the capacity of Deputy States Attorney where he functioned as a prosecuting attorney.

In 1962, Mr. Dickey was admitted to the Virginia State Bar, District of Columbia Bar, and the South Dakota Bar. He is a member of the American Bar Association, Federal Bar Association, and American Trial Lawyers Association.

**Mr. DICKEY.** I am pleased to appear today before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in support of H.R. 7987, a bill to provide for the striking of national medals by the U.S. Mint in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

As the Treasury representative and spokesman I participated in the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission's Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals 2-day meeting last fall which led to the recommendations of the full Commission incorporated in this legislation before you today.

The Treasury feels that the proposals you are considering today are consistent with past precedents for the striking of national medals to commemorate historical events of national significance such as the 200th anniversary of our great Nation. The Treasury, therefore, supports the enactment of H.R. 7987, and would be pleased to carry out the wishes of the Congress as set forth in this bill.

Our able Director of the Mint, Mrs. Mary Brooks, will give you the mint's views on the provisions set forth in this legislation, as well as the mint's position concerning national medals.

I will, of course, be happy to answer any questions you may have.

**Mrs. SULLIVAN.** Thank you, Mr. Dickey.

Now, it is our pleasure to hear the Director of the Mint who is making her first appearance before this subcommittee.

We will place the biographical sketch of Mrs. Brooks in the record at this point.

You may proceed, Mrs. Brooks. If any of your subordinates are here and you would like to identify them, we would be glad to have you do so before you start.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. MARY T. BROOKS, DIRECTOR, U.S. MINT; ACCOMPANIED BY ROY CAHOON, PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER**

(The biographical sketch of Mrs. Brooks follows:)

##### **BIOGRAPHY OF HON. MARY T. BROOKS, 28TH DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. MINT**

Mrs. Mary T. Brooks was appointed by President Nixon in March 1969, to be the twenty-eighth Director of the United States Bureau of the Mint. She is only the third woman to fill this important position.

As Director of the Mint and its six field institutions, Mrs. Brooks heads one of the fastest growing and technologically expanding government bureaus. She is responsible for the manufacture and distribution of an adequate supply of coinage to meet the daily needs of our continually growing economy. Other activities, which come under the supervision of the Director of the Mint, concern the safeguarding of the Government's holdings of monetary metals, the refining of gold and silver, coinage for foreign governments, the manufacture of medals for the armed services, and the manufacture and sale to the public of medals of historic interest and special coin sets of numismatic interest.

Mrs. Brooks assumed her duties as Director of the Mint on September 1, 1969. She had been Assistant Chairman of the Republican National Committee, a posi-

tion she had held since May of 1965. She was also a Senator in the Idaho State Legislature. She was elected to the Senate in 1964 from Blaine County and re-elected from the 21st District in 1966 and 1968. During her tenure in the Idaho Legislature, Mrs. Brooks was Chairman of the Republican Caucus as well as the State Affairs Committee and served on the Fish, Game and Recreation Committee and the Transportation and Defense Committee.

Mrs. Brooks was born in Colby, Kansas and raised in Gooding, Idaho. She attended Mills College in California and received her Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Idaho. She is the daughter of former United States Senator John Thomas of Idaho and served as his Administrative Assistant, prior to his death in 1945. Mrs. Brooks also worked in the family banking chain over the years before the chain was sold to the First Security Corporation. She has managed and developed one of the largest and most successful sheep and cattle ranches in Southern Idaho, the Flat Top Livestock Company, in Muldoon, Idaho.

Married in 1939 to Arthur J. Peavey, Jr., who died in a hunting accident in 1941, Mrs. Brooks has a son, Idaho State Senator John Thomas Peavey, who manages the family sheep and cattle ranch. Her daughter, Mrs. Gordon Eccles, lives in Picabo, Idaho. There are six grandchildren.

Mrs. Brooks was married in 1945 to United States Senator C. Wayland Brooks from Illinois who later served as a member of the Republican National Committee. After his death in 1957, Mrs. Brooks became a member of the Republican National Committee. She was elected Vice Chairman of the Committee on July 29, 1960 and was Official Hostess to the Republican National Convention in Chicago in 1960. She served as Vice Chairman of the Committee on Big City Politics under the Chairmanship of Ray Bliss in 1961. After her resignation from the Republican National Committee in 1963, she returned to Idaho to manage the ranch until her election to the Idaho Senate.

Her present and past memberships in civic, social and political organizations include: Kappa Kappa Gamma, AAUW, American Legion Auxiliary, Board of the Idaho Youth Ranch, Advisory Committee on Women in the Services, Vice Chairman of her Red Cross District, Mental Health Board, Immigrant Service League, Illinois Children's Home and Aid, Light House for the Blind, Arden Shore Association, and Board of Illinois Federation of Republican Women.

Mrs. BROOKS. Yes; thank you, Madam Chairman, for your generosity in giving us this time to talk about this bill. With me I do have Roy Cahoon. He is a public information officer for the mint.

I don't want to be repetitious here. It is a great pleasure to have so many of the committee in attendance and I know how busy you are.

I am a member of the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals established by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and I did participate in the deliberations leading to the recommendations of the full Commission of which Mr. Lang was our chairman.

I want to say that the mint will cooperate to our maximum capability with the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission in making available its San Francisco numismatic mailing facilities for the production of the medals.

Since a maximum of only 14 different medals are to be struck by the U.S. Mint, private mints will have the opportunity to produce all other medals commissioned by the States, localities, and private groups.

I would like to here interject: I don't think it was the Treasury's proposal that we strike any platinum medals.

We have a two-century background in the medallic field. We started making our medals back in 1792 as tokens of fealty and good will for presentation by each succeeding administration to the Indians upon the signing of a treaty or as a special sign of friendship. Today we manufacture over 200 national medals in different categories for sale to the public, in addition to performing services for other government agencies.



In response to acts of Congress we strike medals of a national character upon private order. The attached list, which you mentioned earlier, describes the medals in this commemorative category.

In response to a request of your subcommittee, we wrote the letter which is attached to the statement and prepared for the committee's use a list of the many, many bills introduced in each term of Congress to authorize the striking of commemorative medals.

We would urge the subcommittee to evaluate these bills in terms of these guidelines, recognizing, of course, that the mint will follow expressly the wish of Congress.

To review these briefly, the mint takes the position that a national medal should have significance for all the people. It should honor only those events which have contributed to and advanced the history of the country, or those persons whose superior deeds or achievements have embellished our history, or who are representatives in the finest sense of accomplishment in the service of the Nation.

I wish to assure the subcommittee that we have the capacity to produce the national medals authorized by H.R. 7987 without jeopardizing our responsibilities for producing sufficient coinage for our daily commerce.

Therefore, we feel that the proposed legislation is consistent with past precedents for striking of national medals to commemorate historical locations of national significance, and that these support its enactment.

We would be pleased to carry out the wishes of the Congress as they pertain to the production of medals set forth in the legislation.

Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Brooks with attachments follow:)

#### PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MARY T. BROOKS, DIRECTOR OF THE U.S. MINT

It is indeed a pleasure for me to appear today before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs in support of H.R. 7987, a bill to provide for the striking of national medals by the U.S. Mint in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

As a member of the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals established by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, I participated in the deliberations leading to the recommendations of the full Commission which are reflected in H.R. 7987.

This bill would authorize the U.S. Mint to strike a national medal commemorating the year 1776 and its significance to American independence. It would also authorize the Mint to strike a maximum of thirteen medals, each of a different design, commemorating historical events of great importance recognized nationally as milestones in the continuing progress of the United States of America toward life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The latter medals are intended to be used by the Commission in conjunction with companion commemorative stamps, cancelled on date of issue (both relating to the same event) and contained in specially designed transparent packages called philatelic-numismatic commemoratives.

The U.S. Mint will cooperate to the maximum extent possible with the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission in making available its San Francisco numismatic mailing facilities for promotion of the medals. Since a maximum of only fourteen different medals are to be struck by the U.S. Mint, private mints will have the opportunity to produce all other medals commissioned by the States, localities and private groups.

Under the bill, designs of the various medals are to be determined by the Commission subject to approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals are to be furnished to the Commission at cost.

As you know, the Mint has nearly a two-century background in the medallic field. Our beginnings are rooted in the issuance since 1792 of metallic tokens of fealty and good will for presentation by each succeeding Administration to the Indians, upon the signing of a treaty or as a special sign of friendship. Today, we manufacture over 200 national medals in differing categories for sale to the public, in addition to performing services for other Government agencies; and, in response to Acts of Congress, we strike medals of a national character upon private order. The attached list describes the medals in this commemorative category.

In response to the request of your Subcommittee, the Mint has prepared guidelines for the Committee's use in its consideration and evaluation of the many bills introduced in each term of Congress to authorize the striking of commemorative medals. We would urge the Subcommittee to evaluate these bills in terms of these guidelines, recognizing, of course, that the Mint will act according to the express wishes of the Congress.

To review these guidelines briefly: The Mint takes the position that a national medal should have significance for all the people. It should honor only those events that have contributed to and advanced the history of the country, or those persons whose superior deeds or achievements have embellished our history, or who are representatives of the finest of accomplishment in service to the Nation.

I wish to assure the Subcommittee that the U.S. Mint has the capacity to produce the national medals authorized by H.R. 7987 without jeopardizing its responsibilities for producing sufficient coinage for our daily commerce.

The Mint feels, therefore, that the proposed legislation is consistent with past precedents for the striking of national medals to commemorate historical occasions of national significance, and that these precedents support its enactment. We would be pleased to carry out the wishes of the Congress as they pertain to the production of medals set forth in the legislation.

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,  
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1970.

Hon. MARY BROOKS,  
*Director, Bureau of the Mint,  
Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. BROOKS: In anticipation of prospective hearings by this Subcommittee, I would appreciate your looking over the enclosed material and submitting an official position or statement of policy representing the views of the Bureau of the Mint on standards or guidelines for national medals legislation. It is a matter we have been discussing in this Subcommittee but have not yet resolved.

Seven years ago, the Subcommittee held its only public hearings on commemorative medals and commemorative coins. There are no further copies available of our printed hearings, but I am sure a copy must be available in the files of your Bureau. At that time, the Bureau of the Mint (and the Treasury) strongly opposed all bills proposing the minting of commemorative coins, but just as strongly supported a generous policy of approving bills calling for commemorative medals. Until this year, this Subcommittee has approved routinely all bills submitted by Members of the House proposing the striking of commemorative medals for non-profit organizations.

Last year, in view of numerous changes in the membership of the Subcommittee, an informal meeting was held in executive session to review for our new Members the policy we had been following on such legislation, and your predecessor as Director of the Mint, Miss Eva Adams, testified. I am enclosing excerpts of that testimony in executive session as they relate to commemorative medals, and also a copy of a statement Miss Adams subsequently submitted giving her concept of standards we should consider in approving bills to strike national medals. This information has never been made public, so I ask that you treat it confidentially until we do release it at an appropriate time.

Partly as a result of these discussions last year, we delayed action for some months on H.R. 15118, a bill which finally passed the House July 6th on the Consent Calendar, authorizing the striking of up to 16,000 medals commemorating the 100th anniversary of Ohio Northern University. We had received a letter



questioning the merits or justification of this bill from Medallic Arts Company, which maintained that medals for colleges and universities should be left entirely to private enterprise. However, since we had previously approved a medal for Dartmouth College's 200th anniversary, and since the sponsor of H.R. 15118, Congressman McCulloch of Ohio, advised us that in his opinion fairness dictated that we approve similar medals for Ohio Northern, we decided to go ahead with it. But the Committee report on H.R. 15118 which I am enclosing (House Report 91-1245) makes reference to the fact that guidelines are being drawn by the Subcommittee for the future guidance of Members of Congress in determining whether commemorative medal bills they might consider introducing would be likely to be approved.

Miss Adams' written statement to the Subcommittee gives the historical background of commemorative medals, particularly the list medals sold by the Treasury, but does not, in my opinion, spell out in sufficient detail any usable guidelines we could promulgate for the guidance of Members of the House in deciding whether to introduce such bills with the expectation of having them acted upon favorably. We would like to develop and announce a policy which would serve as a useful standard.

The range of events which could be subject to commemoration through national medals is almost limitless. We do not want to harm private enterprise engaged in this field, nor, on the other hand, overburden the Mint. At the same time, there is a unique distinction to a medal struck by the Mint as a national medal, and such a medal should relate to events of special national significance. How would you define them?

Of course, we will reserve our right as a Congressional body to exercise our own discretion and judgment in acting on any bill of this nature, but since your agency does the actual work on these medals, and is cognizant of the degree of public interest in them, we want the Mint's candid views and suggestions for our own guidelines.

In that connection, I would also like to have an up-to-date list of all commemorative medals manufactured by the Mint for sale by outside organizations. The list should include the name of the organization sponsoring the medal; its address; the name of the officer or representative who carried out the negotiations with the Mint for delivery and payment of the medals, and his address; the number of medals authorized by the enabling legislation and the number actually struck and delivered in each instance, broken down by size or sizes, and composition; and—if available to you—the number actually sold and the prices at which they were sold. (I realize this may not be readily available in all, or even most, instances.)

All of the medals I have seen which were struck under authority of legislation recommended by this Subcommittee since 1963 have been, in my opinion, beautiful examples of the skills of your employees in the Bureau of the Mint, and I have been proud to have been associated with several I personally sponsored—chiefly the St. Louis Bicentennial Medal and the Secret Service (list) Medal. Officials of the Mint have been extremely helpful to this Subcommittee in our consideration of all of these bills, so I have no hesitation now in asking your continued help, knowing what pride the agency takes in its medallic work, as well as in coinage.

I do not wish to set an onerous deadline for compliance with the requests in this letter but I hope we can obtain the information and material reasonably soon. Therefore, could you give me an estimate as to how long it would take to fill this request?

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, *Chairman.*

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, APRIL 25, 1969, OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, BY MISS EVA ADAMS, THEN DIRECTOR OF THE MINT, ON LEGISLATION DEALING WITH THE STRIKING OF COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Do you have any ideas \* \* \* what the number of privately struck medals amounts to over a year's time and if there are many firms in the field—as you know, we went to the Franklin Mint for our Congressional medalions—but the thing I was wondering was, in comparison with the number of medals struck at the Mint, do you feel that you are in competition?

Miss ADAMS. No. They make a thousand times more than we do. I would say even more than that. One company that I know makes medals commemorating all the athletic events—they make medals for everything. There are so many things I just could not possibly enumerate them.

Mr. WYLIE. Is there not something prestigious about having one made by the United States Mint though and would this not encourage organizations to do that?

Miss ADAMS. I think that is basically the reason they come to Congress, because this gives the stamp of approval of the Congress that this event is of a national character.

Mr. WYLIE. In that connection \* \* \* do you have any suggestions as to factors this Committee might take into account when we consider bills for commemorative medals?

Miss ADAMS. I have always felt that it would be extremely helpful (but I have never been asked the question before and I felt it was not proper to suggest). I think it would be helpful if in your work you could establish some standards. There would be no possibility of conflict. I do not want to mention a particular medal but there was one medal which you approved recently and which we made which one private company felt was not of national character. I could not get any concrete reason as to why except it was a local situation. It was a university in a particular state, which was felt made it not proper because, as he said, "Why, every university can do that." I said Congress must have had a good reason for passing it. I have faith, and I did not feel that the criticism was justified, but I do think a set of standards would be good.

Mr. WYLIE. I have the feeling that we should have some guidelines, Madam Chairman, besides the fact that they are going to pay the cost, the entire cost of the medal.

Miss ADAMS. Oh, yes, I think that completely. And, sir, you would be amazed at the number of people who write to us saying would you make a medal. We write a rather strong letter back saying that we would make a medal if Congress so directed us, but we strongly recommend that in this instance, because it is more or less a private matter or certainly a very, very local matter, that it might be well to contact one of the private medallic outfits, and we do not recommend any one company, believe me.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. After all, each one that you do make is done through the direction of Congress under a bill which has been enacted.

Miss ADAMS. That is right.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Well, in the past six years that we have been considering such bills in this Subcommittee, if there was one which was questioned, I do not remember any other one, beside that one, that did not have some kind of national significance.

Miss ADAMS. I think you have done beautifully because I know the pressures, and I think you have done splendidly in selecting those which are really of a national character.

Mr. BROWN. On this subject, would you care to suggest some criteria that in turn have been suggested to you because of your experience?

Miss ADAMS. I would be happy to. I would prefer to do it thoughtfully and submit it to the Committee, if I might, for your future consideration, because we do have correspondence on it and we have done a lot of thinking on it, and we have some memoranda in the file.

Mr. BROWN. Well, you have had a tremendous number of requests, too, and you have already handled many suggested medals and I assume that from these you do develop some kind of standards or experience, at least.

Miss ADAMS. But remember, sir, this would be one Bureau's opinion.

Mr. BROWN. Surely.

Miss ADAMS. Or one Director's opinion, and in no way would I wish to impose our feeling on the Committee because you are absolutely free to direct us under any circumstances. But I will be happy to make a suggestion.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. \* \* \* At our request, could you give us your best judgment \* \* \* on what would be—

Miss ADAMS. We would be more than happy to do so because then some of the doubts would be relieved which probably exists in the minds of some of the (private) companies.

(The following material was subsequently submitted by Miss Adams:)

#### NATIONAL MEDALS—WHAT STANDARDS SHOULD BE APPLIED?

In general, a "national medal" may be said to be one authorized by Act of Congress for presentation to its citizens in appreciation of loyal or distinguished service to their country, or a piece struck in recognition of a significant event pertinent to our Federal Government.



As for the work of the Congress in deciding what is, and what is not, a national medal, a broad yardstick might be a considered and serious judgment made as to whether the individual or event influenced or is likely to influence the broad mainstream of American history and has enriched the lives of the Nation as a whole.

Conversely, this would eliminate Congressional approval of medals of "idle fancy," of only local or sectional importance, and particularly those requested for the specific purpose of commercial exploitation, if the other elements are lacking. In other words, Congress should feel no compulsion to approve a bill honoring one person, or county, or city, the primary purpose of which is to raise funds or to use the proceeds for a celebration, but which has no historical or national relationship to the important events of United States "history-in-the-making."

Commemorative observances for important anniversaries of Statehood for all of the 50 states would properly be of "national character," as the significance of the "United States" is eloquent of the vital role of each of the 50 states involved. Events commemorating widely-recognized and nationally-observed "firsts" can be justified if the development so recognized did actually affect the history of the country. Those who gave their lives in such developments should deserve national honor of this kind if careful weight is given to the influence of their activities, their high caliber and that of their contributions, and the overall constructive implications of the situation involving their martyrdom.

Temporary popularity of an individual, an event, or a cause may require careful judgment, as to whether or not the "test of time" will bear witness to the high and permanent nature and quality of the subject to be honored with the coveted National Medals. A brief look at the history of these memorials may be helpful.

Medals have been used as a form of memorial for centuries. In our own country, the Continental Congress authorized a gold medal for General Washington, the first of such memorials, for his "wise and spirited conduct in the siege and acquisition of Boston." Other Revolutionary War medals were authorized by the Congress—such as one for General Gates for the defeat of General Burgoyne at Saratoga, General Morgan for his victory at Cowpens, General Anthony Wayne for his victory at Stony Point, and John Paul Jones for his valorous action in the conflict between the Bonhomme Richard and the Serapis.

"Mr. Madison's War" resulted in the issuance of a number of medals marking victories on land and sea in the War of 1812.

President Jefferson, and many of his successors, ordered medals of their likeness to be struck and used as an instrument of good will in concluding Indian treaties. President Theodore Roosevelt ordered a medal to be struck commemorating the historic voyage of the "Great White Fleet." President Polk ordered gold medals for Zachary Taylor's successes in Mexico.

In the 1860's it was decided that something should be done to gather together the dies of all the "national" medals which had been produced by act of Congress, and to make bronze copies of them available to the public. Some of the dies had been lost and had to be duplicated; some of the originals were located and placed in the Mint, forming the basic collection of national medals. The first sale of these bronze copies took place at the Mint in October, 1861.

When the Mint laws were revised and codified in 1873, the legislation provided that dies of a national character could be executed by the engraver and national and other medals struck by the Mint, but prohibited the preparation of private medal dies. This was done because "it seems just to exclude the preparation of private medal dies at the Mint, so as not to interfere with the legitimate business of private artists." (Volume 102, Congressional Globe, 1872, Part 2, Page 2307).

The Mint respects this law, and does not try to influence a medal order to keep its own presses busy, when the medal concerned is of private character and ample facilities exist in private industry for its manufacture.

In recent years the Congress has been following the adage that "you do not have great men unless you honor great men," by directing that the Mint produce, and make available to the public, medals honoring a number of outstanding Americans. A gold medal went to Joseph Francis for devising life-saving devices; to Admiral Rickover for the atomic submarine; to Drs. Dooley and Salk for their health work; to Dr. Goddard for his work in rocket propulsion. All of these individuals contributed something of interest to the Nation, and their medals may be said to be truly "national" in the sense they represent a contribution to our culture and welfare.

There are, buried in Mint vaults, a number of other dies of national character which have not been reproduced, since gold medals were awarded the recipients or their families, because the legislation authorizing them did not include a provision for release of bronze copies to the public. To mention a few, there are the medals for General Billy Mitchell, General Pershing, General Marshal, Admirals King and Byrd. The Congress may wish to have a review made of these medals for the purpose of having those of national significance made available to the public. Their release would provide an inspirational heritage to the living, as well as unborn generations of Americans, in their study of the historical events of our Nation and the people who brought them about.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1970.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
*House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in further reference to your letter of July 15th, calling attention to committee action now under consideration to formulate legislation covering authority for the striking and issuance of medals of a national character, and asking for the position of the Bureau of the Mint on the subject.

The Mint, of course, is subject to the wishes of Congress and special legislation enacted providing for the striking of a medal. However, using past examples in the attached list of medals struck that by no stretch of the imagination could be considered national in nature, and in order to stem requests for the striking of such medals, it would be helpful if a definition of a national medal could be spelled out.

The highest honor the country can bestow should be attached to a national medal. If, in all cases, "national" could be defined as nationwide in scope, these medals could become prestigious and treasured symbols of the Federal Government.

Therefore, the Mint takes the position that a national medal should have significance for all the people. It should honor only those events that have contributed to and advanced the history of the country, or those persons whose superior deeds or achievements have embellished our history or who are representative of the finest of accomplishment in service to the Nation.

Admittedly, this definition of "national" needs further delineation. As an example, statehood is a national achievement and certainly qualifies for a national medal marking the occasion.

However, events and individual contributions occurring within a certain locality, region or state, and having meaning only to the residents and history within those borders could be classified as "state medals" and need not be struck by the Mint.

I believe the attached list will give you a good idea of our medals program. Our dealings with the individual sponsoring organization do not require the listing of prices which are charged for these medals, and since no follow-up is made by us after the medals leave our jurisdiction, we are unable to supply this information.

I am looking forward to working with you and your committee on this most important matter and would appreciate the opportunity to discuss it with you at your convenience. Meanwhile, it will be our pleasure to furnish any additional material you feel will assist you.

Sincerely,

MARY BROOKS, *Director of the Mint.*



COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS MANUFACTURED BY THE U.S. MINT FOR SALE BY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS

Sponsoring organization, officer negotiating contract, payment, etc. and address	Number of medals authorized by enabling legislation	Composition of medals	Number of medals actually struck and delivered	Size or sizes of medals (inches)	Price of medals actually sold
Albany, New York 200th Anniversary Committee, Jacob Cheris, chairman, 214 State St., Albany, N.Y.	No specific number authorized; Public Law 83 198 Aug. 5, 1953.	Gold 0.900 Silver 0.925 Bronze	50 1,250 4,000 2,000	1 1/2 1 1/2 1 1/2 1 1/2	
Texas Declaration of Independence, 120th Anniversary and Battles of Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto, Texas Heritage Foundation, Inc., A. Garland Adair, executive director, 612 Capital National Bank Bldg., Austin, Tex.	2,000; Public Law 84-338, Aug. 9, 1955.	Bronze			
Nevada Silver Centennial Committee, Mr. Selby Calkins, manager, Post Office Box 44, Carson City, Nev.	1,000; Public Law 86-29, May 20, 1959.	Silver 0.900.	1,000	1 1/16	
Colorado "Rush to the Rockies" Centennial Commission, William Thayer Tutt, general chairman, Broadmoor Hotel, Colorado Springs, Colo.	10,000; Public Law 86-65, June 23, 1959.	Silver 0.900.	10,000	1 3/16	
West Virginia 100th anniversary, Charles Hodel, chairman, Centennial Commission, State capitol, room 4, Charleston, W. Va.	770,020; Public Law 86-184, Aug. 24, 1959; Public Law 87-711, Sept. 27, 1962.	Platinum Silver 0.900 Bronze	20 6,000 20,000	1 3/16 1 3/16 1 3/16	
Idaho Territorial Centennial Commission, H. J. Swinney, director, 610 Parkway Dr., Boise, Idaho.	10,000; Public Law 86-696, Sept. 2, 1960.	Silver	0	1 3/16	
Century 21 Commission, Ewen C. Dingdall, vice president and general manager, 312 First Ave., North Seattle, Wash.	500,000; Public Law 86-697, Sept. 2, 1960.	Bronze Gold 14 kt. Silver 0.900	4 4 10,015 1,000 140,000 20,000	1 3/16 2 1/2 1 3/16 2 1/2 1 3/16 1 3/16	
Kansas Centennial Commission, Mr. Dale W. McCoy, executive director, 801 Harrison St., Topeka, Kans.	20,000; Public Law 86-393, Mar. 18, 1960.	Bronze Silver, 0.900			
National Pony Express Centennial Association, Mr. Waddell F. Smith, president, 75 Margarita Dr., San Rafael, Calif.	500,000; Public Law 86-394, Mar. 18, 1960.	Gold 14 kt. Silver 0.900 Bronze	4 3,000 5,000 1,000 50,000 5,000	2 1/4 2 1/4 1 3/16 2 1/4 1 3/16 1 3/16	\$40.00 4.50 1.25 75
Mobile, Alabama 250th Anniversary Celebration Corp., Mr. Julian de Ovies, 152 St. Francis St., Mobile, Ala.	5,000; Public Law 87-21, Apr. 24, 1961.	Silver 0.900			
MacArthur Memorial Foundation, W. F. Duckworth, chairman, Norfolk, Va.	500,001; Public Law 87-760, Oct. 9, 1962.	Gold 0.999 Bronze	1 1,000 10,000 5	3 1 3/16 1 3/16	
Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association, Rev. Noel F. Moholy, O.F.M., St. Francis Friary, 1112 28th St., Sacramento, Calif.	300,000; Public Law 88-143.	Gold 14 kt. Platinum Silver	25 10,000 82,000 271,000	1 3/16 1 3/16 1 3/16 1 3/16	750.00 10.00 2.50
Nevada Centennial Commission, Roy A. Hardy, chairman, Post Office Box 2498, Reno, Nev.	20,000; Public Law 88-147, Oct. 16, 1963.	Bronze Silver, 0.900			

See footnotes at end of table, p. 27.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS MANUFACTURED BY THE U.S. MINT FOR SALE BY OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS—Continued

Sponsoring organization, officer negotiating contract, payment, etc. and address	Number of medals authorized by enabling legislation	Composition of medals	Number of medals actually struck and delivered	Size or sizes of medals (inches)	Price of medals actually sold
International Ladies' Garment Workers Union 50th Anniversary, Mr. Harry Crone, promotion director, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.	2,001; Public Law 88-185, Nov. 20, 1962	Silver 0.990	1	3	
New York City Shriners Advisory Board, Mr. L. Porter Moore, secretary, 15 Pine St., New York, N.Y.	765,000; Public Law 88-262, Jan. 31, 1964	Bronze	2,000	3	
St. Louis Bicentennial Corp., Mr. Martin Quigley, Suite 306, 407 North 8th St., St. Louis, Mo.	100,000; Public Law 88-270, Feb. 11, 1964	Gold 14 kt	18	1 5/16	
San Antonio Fair, Inc., Mr. Frank Manupelli, executive vice president, International Exposition HemisFair '68, 421 South Alamo, San Antonio, Tex.	100,000; Public Law 89-382, Mar. 31, 1966	Silver 0.900	18,000	1 5/16	
Alaska Centennial Commission, Mr. Herb Adams, executive director, Post Office Box 1967, Juneau, Alaska.	200,000; Public Law 89-393, Apr. 14, 1966	Silver 0.900	10,000	1 5/16	
Scranton Association, Inc., Post Office Box 1966, Scranton, Pa.	150,000; Public Law 89-400, Apr. 16, 1966	Bronze	13,320	1 5/16	
American Numismatic Association, Mr. Arthur Sipe, 1st vice president, 4021 Bonsall Ave., Drexel Hill, Pa.	50,000; Public Law 89-401, Apr. 16, 1966	Gold 14 kt	15,500	1 5/16	
U.S. Secret Service, James J. Rowley, Chief, 1800 G St., NW., Washington, D.C.	List medal, no maximum number designated; Public Law 89-469, June 24, 1966	Silver 0.900	10,000	1 5/16	
Polish American Congress, Inc., Mr. Chas. Razwarek, president, 2245 Marshall Blvd., South Chicago, Ill.	1,000,000; Public Law 89-527, Aug. 5, 1966	Platinum	100	1 5/16	
New York City Advisory Board, Mr. L. Porter Moore, secretary 15 Pine St., New York, N.Y.	250,000 (Ellis Island); Public Law 89-676, Oct. 15, 1966	Silver 0.900	30	3	
Federal Land Bank System, Mr. Richard Kyle Keith, Mr. Martin C. Powers, Office of Public Information, 1523 L St., NW., Washington, D.C.	2,000; Public Law 89-679, Oct. 15, 1966	Bronze	3,000	3	3.00
U.S. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, construction battalions, (SEABEES), Mrs. Audrey Hanes, curator, C.B., Museum and Center Librarian, U.S.N., C.B.C., Port Hueneme, Calif.	100,000; Public Law 89-783, Nov. 6, 1966	Silver 0.900	40		
San Diego Two-Hundredth Anniversary, Inc., Mr. John B. Gough, general manager, room 801, County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, Calif.	500,000; Public Law 90-124, Nov. 4, 1967	Bronze	20	1 5/16	
		Silver 0.900	2,000	1 5/16	
		Bronze	2,000	3	
		Silver 0.900	3,500	1 5/16	
		Bronze	5,000	1 5/16	
		Silver 0.900	200	3	
		Bronze	750	3	
		Silver 0.900	1,250	3	
		Silver 0.900	55,000	1 5/16	
		Bronze	54,200	1 5/16	
		Bronze	29,500	3 1/16	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 27.



American Legion 50th Anniversary, Inc., William E. Galbraith, Washington Office of National Commander, 1608 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.	1,000,000; Public Law 90-127, Nov. 4, 1967	3,000	2 1/2
Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi, Mr. E. V. Caboe, Jr., Post Office Box 175, Webb, Miss.	100,000; Public Law 90-128, Nov. 4, 1967	118,700	2 1/2
Golden Spike Centennial Celebration Commission, Washington, D.C., Mr. George Christensen, chairman, 22 Richards St., Salt Lake City, Utah.	500,000; Public Law 90-303, May 10, 1968	5,000	1 1/2
Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., Bicentennial Planning Committee, Mr. A. Alexander Fanelli, executive secretary, 306 Parkhurst Hall, Hanover, N.H.	25,000; Public Law 90-528, Sept. 28, 1968	40,000	3
Memphis Sesqui-centennial Corp., Mr. Howard Wiley, president, room 905, city hall, Memphis, Tenn.	100,000; Public Law 90-60, Oct. 17, 1968	4,000	3
Walt Disney Productions, Mr. James L. Stewart, administrative assistant to the executive vice president, 500 South Buena Vista St., Burbank, Calif.	100,000; Public Law 90-316, May 24, 1968	5,000	1 1/2
Fulton Area Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Mrs. Carmen Rand, manager, Post Office Box 579 (Westminster College) and Fulton, Mo. (Winston Churchill mem.)	100,000; Public Law 91-12, May 7, 1969	8,000	1 1/2
American Fisheries Society, Robert F. Hutton, suite 1040, Washington Bld., Washington, D.C.	100,000; Public Law 91-13, May 15, 1969	1,300	1 1/2
South Carolina Bicentennial Commission, Mr. James M. Burnett, executive director, 829 Richland St., Post Office Box 1970, Columbia, S.C.	No specific number authorized; Public Law 91-16, May 28, 1969	1,900	1 1/2
Wichita Centennial, Inc., Mr. Robert Carroll, managing director, Post Office Box 1969, Wichita, Kans.	100,000; Public Law 91-18, May 28, 1969	3,000	1 1/2
Alabama Sesqui-centennial Commission, Mr. R. H. Rockhold, State coordinator, suite 103, 15 Office Park, Birmingham, Ala.	55,000; Public Law 91-29, June 17, 1969	3,000	1 1/2
U.S. Diplomatic Courier Service, Mr. Jack Grover, Pouch Control Officer, U.S. Diplomatic Courier Association, Department of State, B-528, Washington, D.C.	List medal, no maximum number designated; Public Law 91-48, July 22, 1969	20,000	1 1/2
San Antonio Conservation Society (Jose Antonio Navarro), Mrs. Brooks Martin, president, 511 Vibla St., San Antonio, Tex.	100,000; Public Law 91-244, May 9, 1970	1,500	1 1/2
Stone Mountain Memorial Association, Stone Mountain, Ga.	500,000; Public Law 91-254, May 14, 1970	4,000	1 1/2
		10,000	1 1/2
		12,000	1 1/2
		( <sup>3</sup> )	

<sup>1</sup> Medals not manufactured by Mint. See letter of Jan. 26, 1963, from Senator Frank Church.

<sup>2</sup> 5,000 proof; 15,000 regular.

<sup>3</sup> See letter of June 22, 1966 in Scranton file.

<sup>4</sup> No action taken.

<sup>5</sup> Medals were not produced by Mint. See letter of Feb. 20, 1968, from William E. Galbraith.

<sup>6</sup> Medals were not produced by Mint. See letter of Sept. 26, 1967, from Mr. Caboe.

<sup>7</sup> Incomplete order not known how many in silver and bronze.

<sup>8</sup> Manufacturing operations pending. An inquiry has been received from Congressman Blackburn on behalf of the sponsors of this legislation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mrs. Brooks.

I want to welcome you once again to the subcommittee. Some of us have been on the subcommittee since 1963, when we held our last public hearing on medals; others are new members of the committee or the subcommittee. But I am sure that I speak for all of us when I say that we admire the vigorous way in which you are doing your job.

The members of the subcommittee who were here at the time have a warm spot for your predecessor, Miss Eva Adams. Both of you have demonstrated, I think, that women can perform difficult tasks in a very commendable way.

Do you feel that the numismatic activities of the mint, particularly in the medallic field, constitute in any way, or threaten to become, unfair Government competition to private enterprise? We will be hearing from some of the private manufacturers later this morning, so we would like to have your views on this issue.

Mrs. BROOKS. No; I do not in any sense, because we are only producing the medals that are authorized by law. We only have them available in official Government facilities and they have gained wide acceptance. I believe a sense of history is developing in the country. The increasing interest in the collection of historic medals is evidenced everywhere I look. People are much more interested in the history of their country than they were a few years ago. I think this is a very healthy trend. I think we need this. I think our young people need to be dedicated to their country's history. I have a strong feeling that what we are doing by selling our medals in the lobbies of our mints, why we have three or four thousand children every day almost the year around, at a price they can afford to pay, is instilling in them an interest in their country's history. I have a strong feeling that in the 5 years now that we have before the bicentennial we have a tremendous opportunity to get inside the children's minds and instill some pride of country, not only of the past, but of the future.

But I do think that the collecting of medals has grown considerably. We are only doing the medals that we have been doing for 200 years, I can't see that we are competing in any way with private medallic companies.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. You are striking the medals that the Congress authorized you to do?

Mrs. BROOKS. That is right; they are only the official authorized medals.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The only thing I would like to stress again is that I think that we should have stronger policy guidance from the Treasury in its reports to us on some of these bills that would help us to maintain stricter standards so that as members introduce legislation for medals that may not have a truly national aspect, or introduce legislation for medals that should probably be the work of private industry, then we can say: "Well, we would like to help you out and pass this bill, but it is the thinking of the Treasury that this is not a truly national medal."

When we began to question some of these bills, members would say: "Well, you passed so-and-so's bill and that was no different, so why shouldn't mine get through, too?" A national medal has more significance, of course, and it is an official U.S. medal, while a medal that is struck by a private firm in their minds would not have the same na-



tional aspect or prestige. So we do want to limit them to circumstances which have truly national significance. And we need some official backup on this.

I have other questions, but I will pass around first to the members.  
Mr. MINISH. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. Brooks, it is nice to have you before the committee, and I want to commend you, not only on the contents of your statement, but on its brevity.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Wylie.

Mr. WYLIE. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I am sorry I was late and didn't hear your statement, Mrs. Brooks, but I was just wondering: did you testify in support of either of the bills in preference to the other? There are two bills before us calling for an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

Mrs. BROOKS. No; I testified in support of H.R. 7987.

Mr. WYLIE. And that would be in preference to H.R. 9408. I notice that H.R. 7987 calls for the striking of the bicentennial medal, but it doesn't indicate what it should be made of. Did you touch on that in your statement?

Mrs. BROOKS. Well, we had some informal discussion about the making of the medal and having it so it would not be so very expensive for the public. Besides the bronze, my people came up with the suggestion that it might be made of German silver.

Mr. WYLIE. German silver?

Mrs. BROOKS. Of German silver.

Mr. WYLIE. Is that a silver that is mined in Germany?

Mrs. BROOKS. It doesn't have any silver in it. It is a composition of nickel, lead, and zinc.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I just say that when this hearing was called, only one bill had been introduced, so this hearing was called on H.R. 7987, which is an administration measure. Congressman McClure, who had asked to come in this morning and speak on that bill, meanwhile introduced a somewhat different bill of his own last Thursday.

Mr. WYLIE. He did testify earlier?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. WYLIE. He called for specific medals: one with silver and one with bronze. Had H.R. 9408 been called to your attention before you came to the meeting this morning?

Mrs. BROOKS. No; it had not.

Mr. WYLIE. I think it might be appropriate if they did look at H.R. 9408 and H.R. 7987 and indicated, perhaps, a preference.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We did discuss that, Mr. Wylie, with Congressman McClure. The other witnesses apparently had not had a chance to look at the part of the McClure bill that calls for issuance of commemorative coins as well as medals and they were going to give us information on that when they had had a chance to study it, because the McClure bill has only become available over the weekend.

Mr. WYLIE. Thank you very much.

Mrs. BROOKS. You know, we only strike medals according to the will of Congress.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Under H.R. 7987 it is up to the Commission to decide what type materials they want to use in their medals; it is not for you to decide, because they have to pay for everything you produce

for them, and then they go out and sell these medals to the public. They would not use any Treasury silver, for instance, because none is available any longer for such purposes.

Mrs. BROOKS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Koch.

Mr. KOCH. I would just like to commend the three witnesses, but I take special pleasure in mentioning the fact that George Lang and I are friends of long standing.

I did not know that you were a member of the Bicentennial Commission. I know that you are involved in many cultural and civic matters, and this is just another feather in your cap. And it is nice to have you here and to hear your presentation.

Mr. LANG. Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I would like the record to show at this point that the Franklin Mint started in my congressional district approximately 6 or 7 years ago and employed perhaps 8 or 10 people. The Franklin Mint has enjoyed such great success that they now employ over 1,000 people, and I think their gross annual sales are something in excess of \$50 million. In fact, the Franklin Mint was so successful that they moved out of my district, unfortunately.

As a result of the Franklin Mint being established in my district and growing, I have had a chance to observe their operations over the years so that I do understand in great detail the operation of private mints.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They are going to be represented here, so you can compliment them to their face.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

I want to express my appreciation to Mrs. Brooks and Mr. Dickey and Mr. Lang for appearing here this morning.

You know, we all regard the National Commemorative Medal of the ARBC to be a medal of great importance.

Mrs. Brooks, you looked a little surprised when Mr. McClure answered my question in his statement and said that he learned from some of your people that bronze and German silver and platinum were to be used in these medals, or at least that was his understanding. Were you surprised?

Mrs. BROOKS. Well, I didn't think that anybody in our department had talked about making anything in platinum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The thing that surprises me to a certain degree is the fact that such an important commemorative medal should be made of German silver.

Mrs. BROOKS. We will make it from whatever we are ordered to make it from.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You understand that H.R. 7987 doesn't order you to do anything in the way of metal. It just says "suitable metal."

Mrs. BROOKS. That is right.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I think Mr. Lang wants to answer that, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right.



Mr. LANG. If I may be allowed, I would like to paraphrase your statement in the Congressional Record of October 14, 1970. Madam Chairman, recommending that the official medals will not be so limited in quantity that the individual collectors are unable to obtain copies or sets except at a very high premium in the coin or medal market. Also, Mrs. Sullivan, you said that the Commission's first interest ought to be the public participation, rather than how much money can be raised, or what profits can be enjoyed. You said you were sure that is also the intention of the members of the Commission and the managers of the bill passed last year to amend the law creating the Commission.

I think this clearly answers Congressman Williams' question.

(Relevant excerpts from the debate in the House on October 14, 1970, follow:)

[From the Congressional Record, Oct. 14, 1970]

#### AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 16408) to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 16408, with Mr. Gonzalez in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Rogers) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. Wiggins), will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Rogers).

(Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 16408, which provides for a series of amendments to the joint resolution which established the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

This measure has been recommended to us by the administration and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary in the form of an executive communication.

The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was established on July 4, 1966, under the provisions of Public Law 89-491. That statute gives to the Commission the responsibility of planning, encouraging, developing, and coordinating the commemoration of the 200th anniversary of our Nation's birthday.

As the Commission is presently structured, it includes 17 members from private life who are appointed by the President, one of whom is designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission. In addition to members from private life, the Commission also includes 18 members representing various branches and agencies of the Federal Government.

In connection with the discharge of its responsibilities, the Commission has been directed to develop a national plan of commemorative activities throughout the Nation. This plan has been formulated and was submitted to the President in report form on July 4 of this year.

The purpose of the proposal now pending before you is to make several changes in the Statute which established the Commission. Summarized in brief, these changes are as follows:

First, the proposed bill provides authorizations for appropriations for fiscal year 1971. Although in the proposal as recommended by the Commission authorization for appropriations would have been open ended for the duration of the entire life of the Commission through 1983, under the amendment adopted by your committee the authorization is limited to fiscal year 1971. Under the committee amendment the authorization is also limited to \$373,000. Although the Commission had originally requested \$375,000, it was determined that there would be a \$2,000 carryover from 1970. Correspondingly, in the committee's amendment, the authorization has been adjusted accordingly.

Second, the bill would add the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development as members of the Commission.

Third, the bill would permit payment to consultants of the amount permitted under the general provisions of law in lieu of the \$75 maximum permitted under the present section 6(c) of the act.

Fourth, the bill would permit the Commission the exclusive use of distinctive logos, symbols or marks which will be designed as the hallmarks of the official bicentennial commemoration.

The Judiciary Committee held hearings on this proposal on May 6, 1970, and has considered the proposal carefully. In our view, this bill would serve a very worthy objective.

The Senate, on June 26, 1970, passed a bill, S. 3630, which is identical except for certain typographical errors.

Finally, I would like also to call attention to the fact that the appropriations authorizing this legislation have already been approved by Congress. Under Public Law 91-361, the Department of the Interior Appropriations Act, \$373,000 has been appropriated for 1971 subject to the enactment by Congress of H.R. 16408, S. 3630, or similar legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is highly meritorious, the appropriations have already been agreed upon and I, therefore, urge that we give this proposal prompt and favorable consideration today.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for some questions?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I should like to know: Is it the intention of the Commission to seek to raise funds through the sale of commemorative medals—which, of course, would be a valid idea?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes; they may be able to do that.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. As the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency which has jurisdiction over coinage matters and commemorative medals, I want to assure the gentleman that we would certainly consider sympathetically any proposals of the Commission for authorization of national medals, and perhaps even for special commemorative coins—although that is a very controversial aspect. But I hope that in any planning which might go into this matter on the part of the Commission, it is kept firmly in mind that as a public agency, a governmental body, it should assume direct responsibility for the distribution of such items, under conditions which will enable the widest possible number of citizens to obtain copies or sets at reasonable prices. I mention that because I suspect there will be a tremendous effort made to have the Commission turn out merchandise for sale by private sellers and dealers, and in that situation there is always a possibility of having the output limited in quantity in order to make the items more valuable in the collector market. Can the gentleman assure me that any official souvenir items manufactured under the authority of the Commission, and offered for sale to the public, will not be so limited in quantity that individual collectors are unable to obtain copies or sets except at very high premiums in the coin or medal markets?

If the gentleman really does not have a complete answer on that question I wish he would put it in the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I should like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Marsh) who is a member of the Commission.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I just finish with one more question, and then I shall be glad to have the gentleman comment?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I know that this legislation does not touch directly on the point I have just raised, but in view of all of the interest on the part of private firms seeking to capitalize on the bicentennial, I thought it would be useful to establish the fact that the Commission's first interest is in the public's participation,



rather than in how much money can be raised or what profits can be enjoyed. I am sure that is the intention of the members of the Commission and of the managers of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That certainly is the intention of the managers of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Marsh).

Mr. MARSH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I particularly thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for the points she has made.

The questions raised have been raised in their first stage in the Commission. I serve on the Commission, as does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Saylor). This is one of the things I suspect will be a subject of discussion at the October meeting of the Commission.

The points you make are the type of guidance which I think are quite helpful to the Commission in its consideration of the matter. I can assure the gentlewoman that I will bring these points to the attention of the Commission. I very much appreciate your calling it to the attention of the House today.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a member of the Commission.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado and to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri, as our colleague from Virginia said, this item is on the agenda for our meeting in the latter part of the month. One of the guidelines which some of the members of the Commission have already sent in as preliminaries is in line with what you have suggested. We want the broadest base possible for all Americans to participate and do not want this to be a moneymaking arrangement for anyone. One of the things we have recommended before it comes to the Congress is that no firm, corporation, or individual will be given a monopoly to sell any of the items so that they can make a profit—and it would be a tremendous profit—at the expense of the public.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are you trying to tell me that what you have just read to me justifies the use of German silver, which contains absolutely no silver, in the making of our bicentennial commemorative coin; is that what you are telling me?

Mr. LANG. I would like to, if you would allow me—we are planning to sell this——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am simply asking you about what you have just read.

Mr. LANG. I would like to answer, if I may. I was reporting what Mrs. Sullivan had said last year in the House of Representatives.

The ARBC is planning to sell this philatelic-numismatic combination with all its contents in a special wrapper, which will be permanent, for probably around \$5, which will allow millions of people—children, Boy Scouts, high school kids, anybody—to buy this combination and get the message and get the bicentennial spirit now and forever. If you use silver, if you make it of sterling, or almost sterling quality, you would have to sell it, if I remember correctly, from \$11.25.

Thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the size of that coin that you are proposing in this philatelic-numismatic combination?

Mr. LANG. I would be happy to submit to you all details that we have worked out. I can do it within 24 hours.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will you furnish it for the record, because the difference between \$5 and \$11 can buy an awful lot of silver.

Mrs. Brooks, if we pass H.R. 7987, how many additional people do you think you will have to employ in the U.S. Mint to produce the medals we are talking about?

Mrs. BROOKS. None at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How many of those medals do you think you are going to sell? What do you think the demand is going to be?

Mrs. BROOKS. I would think we would probably sell many of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You would not employ any additional people?

Mrs. BROOKS. I don't believe it would be necessary; no.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Have you employed any additional people for the production of the Eisenhower dollar?

Mrs. BROOKS. Of course we have.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You don't think that the demand for the commemorative medal is going to be as great as the Eisenhower dollar?

Mrs. BROOKS. Well, I think it would be wonderful if we could sell 150 million of the commemorative medal coins for the ARBC. We will have an enormous mailing list by the time we are well into our Eisenhower mailing, but this does not require the type of help that the Eisenhower dollar required.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You don't even have the design yet and you already know that it will not require anything like what was required by the Eisenhower dollar.

Mrs. BROOKS. I will leave that to Mr. Lang to answer.

Mr. LANG. First of all, I would like to clarify the differentiation between the national medal and the so-called PNC or philatelic-numismatic combination. The philatelic-numismatic combination, which we feel should really carry the message which we are trying to achieve—at this point with very limited success—is the one in which we are proposing to use the German silver in order to have a low-enough price.

For the national medal, the discussions did not reach the decision stage as to whether it ought to be silver, German silver, or any other metal.

The size, by the way—I just received that information for the philatelic-numismatic combination medal. It is  $1\frac{5}{16}$  inches large.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, for the national medal you haven't worked out the details?

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So the answer to my question is that we just don't have the information as to how many we anticipate selling and what difficulty is going to be encountered in minting those medals.

One last question, Mrs. Brooks: I know that on a number of occasions I personally ordered proof sets from the U.S. Mint, and I have encountered delays of months. I would hope that this wouldn't happen in the minting of our national medal for the ARBC. But, can you give me some idea of the timing you expect to follow in the producing and the distributing of the uncirculated, nonproof Eisenhower dollars?

Mrs. BROOKS. Your question is, again, the timing of the nonproof uncirculated?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The uncirculated, nonproof Eisenhower dollars.

Mrs. BROOKS. The uncirculated and the proof are two different things. The proof dollars are the very carefully polished, deep relief, special-packaged dollars.

The uncirculated dollars are made faster and without as much care and personal handling. We will begin distributing uncirculated—we



are legally taking orders as of tomorrow, July 1. I might add that the public doesn't listen very well. We have already had a million orders before the 1st of July. We will have to wait a couple of weeks before we decide whether we have to reallocate, whether we will have enough dollars to fill the orders that are going to be pouring in on us.

We hope to get into the shipping by the middle to the end of August. This is a tremendous job of paperwork, computer work. When you sell anything in the hundreds of millions, it requires a great deal of care and detail.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On the proof Eisenhower dollars, you are going to go into production on that in the middle of August?

Mrs. BROOKS. We are in production now of the uncirculated, and we are shortly going to start making up the proofs also. We are making the uncirculated silver dollar now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In your mind, this national commemorative medal will be handled in the same way and polished and so forth, just as the proof of the Eisenhower dollar?

Mrs. BROOKS. No; not this small one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am talking about the national medal.

Mrs. BROOKS. The national medal. Do you mean the yearly medal? The national medal, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It will be handled in the same way as the Eisenhower dollar.

Madam Chairman, I have some questions to ask Mr. Lang.

Mr. Lang, on page 3 of your statement—

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Will you make them as brief as you can, because the other members also want to question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On page 3 of your statement, Mr. Lang, paragraph 3, you say:

I wish to point out that, as a considered policy decision of the Commission, no panel members are in the business of producing, distributing, or selling commemorative coins or medals.

When was this decision made by the Commission?

Mr. LANG. Since the Commission held, over a period of 2 years, I imagine, enough hearings to fill a good-sized room with the record, I cannot answer offhand. But I can answer you that, again, within the 24 hours, the information will be in your office, to show that it was reached in an orderly manner to avoid a continuous clash of interests.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Please furnish that for the record, and please send a copy of the minutes which are reflected.

Mr. LANG. I will be delighted to.

(The following additional information was submitted for inclusion in the record at this point:)

Mr. George E. Lang, Commission Member, was designated by the Commission in February, 1970, as Chairman of an Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals. Screening and selection of Panel Members was under his direction. No members were selected who were in the business of producing, distributing or selling commemorative coins or medals. This was a policy established and followed by Mr. Lang after consultation with several Commission Members. It is not reflected in any written minutes; however, its results are apparent from a review of Panel Membership. Also, the decision in retrospect appears to be eminently sound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. In the last paragraph of this page: "Following months of deliberation, the panel submitted its recommendations to the full Commission, which accepted them in toto." I understand that these recommendations are reflected in H.R. 7987.

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You say that you considered this proposal of this philatelic-numismatic series for months?

Mr. LANG. I am sorry, I didn't hear you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The series that you just described, where you were going to have a medal and a stamp combined with a first-day cover. You considered this for months?

Mr. LANG. It was part of the proposal submitted by the Subcommittee on Coins and Medals to the full Commission which approved it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am talking about the fact that the recommendations received months of deliberation.

Mr. LANG. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would also like to have you furnish for the record a copy of those deliberations, as to when this proposal was made to the panel and on what date it was adopted by the panel.

Mr. LANG. I know it was some time in August, but we will furnish all of it to you.

We also have the individual votings with signatures and comments of every member, including official members, which I think included three Senators and three Congressmen. (See page 42.)

(The following additional information was submitted for inclusion in the record at this point:)

The Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals became operative in May, 1970. ARBC staff developed a series of reports which were circulated for Panel consideration and comments. Such reports included incoming correspondence and recommendations from various sources regarding coins and medals. The third report included a suggestion dated June 22, 1970, from Mrs. Margo Russell, editor of Coin World for a philatelic-numismatic commemorative. The reports were progressively refined and developed. The fifth and final report was issued following the plenary panel meeting in September 1970 and was the basis for the adoption by the full Commission of the panel recommendations. The PNC recommendation together with all other panel recommendations were submitted to the full Commission by mail on December 24, 1970. Mail ballots on the recommendations were received from 28 Commission members. Except for one abstention, the vote was unanimously in favor of the PNC recommendation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that following your public hearings you had an executive session, and a Mr. John Baker attended the executive session. Why was Mr. John Baker present and who did he represent?

Mr. LANG. John Baker is, I think, the president or owner of a corporation in California called the 99 Corp., which is the inventor of, and holds a patent for, the philatelic-numismatic combination packet. He offered the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission the right to use this packet without any remuneration to him. And the subcommittee suspended its hearings for approximately 10 or 12 minutes to question him on his experience in problems in connection with the distribution of such packet, and asked him to give us several of the samples, which he did. After 10 or 12 minutes of the hearing he left, and the hearing was reconvened.



Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that the records show that Mr. John Baker, the president of the corporation, did not testify in the public hearings, and yet he was invited into your executive session. Now, why weren't representatives of other companies expert in the packaging and marketing field invited to this meeting? Why was John Baker the only exception?

Mr. LANG. Because he is the man who holds a patent, and he offered the free use of this to the ARBC. If any corporation, including the Franklin Mint, had had the same thing, we would have invited them. But I would like to put in the record very clearly, Congressman Williams, that he was not part of the second-day closed session deliberations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He was only part of the recess period, I understand.

Mr. LANG. That is correct. I would like to have that on the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What patents do other companies that are expert in the field of marketing, distributing and packaging hold?

Mr. LANG. None which interests us presently. However, I would like to add—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you have the full knowledge of the patent rights and the competing designs that other companies have?

Mr. LANG. I have a full knowledge of what the coins and medals panel was interested in doing in connection with the commemoration. In this very important area, only one company has a patent. Consequently, to go wild into the blue yonder and try to get any other kind of related patents, which have nothing to do with us, would add to the bureaucratic quagmire which we are enveloped in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would have been nice if you had been operating with enough knowledge of what patents the other companies had before you decided you just wanted this particular patent.

Mr. LANG. In the room is Patrick Butler, who for over 2 years, I think, worked on this project, and interviewed, I would roughly estimate, over 500 people in the business. Patrick Butler, at that time, was a member of the ARBC staff. Presently, he is with another government agency. The record, if you would care to see it—and we will be happy to transport it with six horses to the office, because it will take that many—you can see that everyone was invited, and everyone was heard, and everybody was welcome to contribute whatever they wanted to *but not for commercial profit*.

(The following statement was submitted by Mr. Lang for inclusion at this point in the record:)

I am a private citizen who spends untold hours on behalf of the Bicentennial Commission simply because I believe it to be an extraordinary and unusually important occasion not only to rededicate ourselves to the Spirit of '76 but also to take this chance to unite our nation. There are times when the profit motive—desirable as it is—must take a back seat and if there ever was such a time the next five years will be it. This project has already been delayed for at least one year, all because of one single private firm which wants to grow even faster than its present fundamental multiplication of gross and net income.

We have no axe to grind. At the ARBC we are only trying to fulfill the requirement set up for us by the Congress and which is developing in a most impressive fashion in all areas except for one in connection with medals for the reasons above-mentioned. In the name of the distinguished Commission members which includes many of your colleagues, I ask you to take the necessary steps which would assure your Committee approval and passage of the bill, H.R. 7987.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I must pass the questioning on, Mr. Williams. If you have other questions of Mr. Lang and Mrs. Brooks, will you submit them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do have some other questions of Mr. Lang. Perhaps I can ask them at a later time.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I don't have any questions. I would like to thank the panel that is here testifying. I favor H.R. 7987, but I have no specific question at this time.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Gonzalez.

Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. HECKLER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I want to thank the witnesses for their testimony, especially Mrs. Brooks. I think she has done an outstanding job as Director of the Mint. I am very impressed with it.

I am thoroughly in sympathy with, and in fact support, the suggestions which Mr. Lang has made and the proposals contained in his testimony.

However, I have just one question for Mrs. Brooks, which refers to the productive capacity of the mint. A few years ago, we suffered from a shortage of coins. I presume from your statement that you have been able to increase the production sufficiently to relieve the shortage, and I want to commend you for that. I want to be sure that at this time we are not burdening the mint with the job of striking medals unless the productive capacity has been assured, under the circumstances which might exist with an overload of orders for these particular medals. Do you feel that the productive capacity is sufficient to take on the job of striking these medals as well?

Mrs. BROOKS. I certainly do. We now, of course, have the Philadelphia Mint in operation, which we did not have 6 years ago. I have to pay tribute again to Mrs. Adams, who saw this project through almost to completion before I came into my office. We have implemented our facilities and are getting ready for the vast hoard of production involved in this Eisenhower dollar program. We have added to our staff both production-wise and in connection with the handling of inquiries from the public, and in many different ways. We have added to our capacity and we have no fear at all that this could be an overwhelming burden.

Mrs. HECKLER. I also have a question for Mr. Dickey.

Thank you, Mrs. Brooks.

I noticed that the administration bill, H.R. 7987, leaves to the Treasury to decide the metal content of the medal whereas Congressman McClure's bill specifies the use of silver. There has been a shortage of silver and I would not want to aggravate that. I wonder if it is because of the silver shortage that you have recommended administrative discretion in the administration bill and, secondly, I would like to know what the present situation is with regard to silver supply.

Mr. DICKEY. The Federal Government on November 10 of last year sold the last of its silver inventory. We still have some silver inventory basically for the production of the Eisenhower dollar. But we are no longer in the silver market as such. I do not want to get into the business of trying to determine whether there is a shortage or surplus of silver. We are simply out of that market.



We would defer to the Bicentennial Commission with respect to the content of the medals. We have the capacity in the mint to make medals of varying kinds and content. We just do not wish to take a position on that. We will be counseling with the Bicentennial Commission as to what they think will be optimum in terms of metal content, in terms of market, and the pattern of distribution, and all these sundry factors. But we will defer to other peoples' judgment on that, consistent with our production capacity and technological implications.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Dickey, in view of the fact that Mr. McClure's bill specifies the use of silver, would you say in view of the statement that you have already made and the fact that the Government has gotten out of the silver market, that you would oppose the use of silver in those coins?

Mr. DICKEY. I think we would probably take a no-objection posture on that. I am just speculating. We at one point got out of the silver market. The question of silver content of the Eisenhower dollar was the subject of considerable debate here in the Congress. We aren't going to be in the silver market any more. You recall that there was considerable discussion as to the number of silver-content dollars that should be made. A compromise was worked out. I just didn't want to take a position on silver content right now. I think that is a matter for the judgment of the Congress.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Is this not what the Commission itself is supposed to decide? They are the ones who are going to pay for these medals and dispose of them, and it is going to be up to their judgment. We have six Members of the Congress on the Commission and it is going to be the Commission's judgment as to what type medals to make, how many, and what the costs will be that they are willing to pay. (See p. 42.)

Mr. DICKEY. That is correct. We would have to go into the market to buy silver if we were going to produce silver content medals. I might say that I do not feel that a great deal of silver would be purchased in terms of the total amount of silver sold in the market annually.

Mrs. HECKLER. I did not hear your last statement.

Mr. DICKEY. I say the amount of silver that would have to be purchased in order to provide silver content medals in this context would not be appreciable in terms of the total amount of silver that is sold annually in the United States for commercial purposes.

Mrs. HECKLER. Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. St Germain?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Madam Chairman, a few questions.

Mrs. Brooks, you state that you have added personnel in order to aid in the production of the Eisenhower medal?

Mrs. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. You stated here that you would not have to add personnel for the production of the coins contemplated in this legislation. In effect, are you telling us with the decrease in production, once you have gone over the hill on the production of the Eisenhower dollar, then these added employees can be put to work on these additional coins?

Mrs. BROOKS. We hope that the bulk of the sale of our uncirculated dollars, the 138 million, we would hope that we would have these all made and delivered in 2 years?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. How many additional employees did you put on for the Eisenhower dollar?

Mrs. BROOKS. I don't believe I have that figure right at hand.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 200, 500, a thousand?

Mrs. BROOKS. Oh, no.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 4,000?

Mrs. BROOKS. I think it is about 150 at this point.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 150. But you will now retain these people; correct?

Mrs. BROOKS. Only until we don't need them any longer. We don't intend to keep them forever, no.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The point is, if you go into the business of additional coins, you will have them; right?

Mrs. BROOKS. Well, we would make that judgment when we were told how many medals were needed, and how many were to be struck. We are cleaned up and we can continue to keep the employees on if it is necessary.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. You see what bothers me. I was out there listening when you were asked the question as to whether or not you needed additional employees to produce these coins. Let's face it, leprechauns aren't going to come in and run the machines to produce these coins; it is going to take personnel and, therefore, it is going to cost money; is that correct?

Mrs. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. It is going to cost the Government, or is the Government going to make money on the production of these coins?

Mrs. BROOKS. No, we would make these coins for the Bicentennial Commission at cost.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. At cost. Then they will be distributed by a corporation—perhaps the member of the Commission would like to answer this question—there would be a separate corporation that would take care of the distribution of these coins?

Mr. LANG. The present plan is to use the private sector on a competitive basis to handle all packaging and mailing.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Packaging and mailing?

Mr. LANG. That is right; shipping, order taking, everything, completely.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. But those firms will make a profit; is that correct?

Mr. LANG. I presume so, yes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. They are not going to do it for nothing?

Mr. LANG. Of course not.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Where does that profit go, to the private firm?

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Nothing further, Madam Chairman.

(The following material was submitted for insertion in the record at this point:)

The ARBC expects that any private firms bidding for a contract for the handling, packaging, and mailing of commemorative medals will include in its bid price an increment representing an anticipated normal fee or profit. ARBC would not expect a commercial contractor to do the work free.

However, the ARBC medal price to the public will be set at a reasonable level above total production and distribution costs so as to result in revenues to ARBC available for funding Bicentennial programs and thus reduce the need for appropriations accordingly.



Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. McKinney.

Mr. McKINNEY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I would like to thank the witnesses and say it is a delight to see Mrs. Brooks for the first time.

I was going to yield some of my time, so I will be very brief.

Mrs. Brooks, I am just concerned about one coin, and that is the 50-cent piece. I live part time in Vermont, and there isn't a 50-cent piece within 50 miles that I can find. I just came back from the home of the happy coin, Las Vegas, and they say they haven't seen a 50-cent piece in 2 years. I don't know what happens to 50-cent pieces. I am beginning to think that they are thrown in the ocean, but I would hope that if you find you can't create these commemorative medals without hurting the coinage, that you would pass the job on to private enterprise.

Mrs. Brooks. Mr. Congressman, I am glad that you brought this subject up. We have on hand the new issue of the Kennedy half, 300 million of them. They are in the hands of the Federal Reserve banks. The Kennedy half has had a long and checkered career. We made 1,250 million of the silver ones. Practically all of those were hoarded, they disappeared or were used in Europe. I think perhaps because of their reverence for the late President, and because they had silver content. It was the only coin at that point that had silver in it. So they were hoarded. We are now making them of the new cupra nickel. As I say, we have approximately 300 million of them in the hands of the Federal Reserve banks, and if the public will go in and ask for 50-cent pieces, they will have them coming out of their ears.

Mr. McKINNEY. That is nice to know.

The only other question that I would bring up is that I would like to strongly suggest that these medals be available to every American citizen as soon as possible. I strongly feel that to make them of silver when the silver market is a wildly fluctuating market would be a tremendous mistake, I would hate to think, for instance, that my children would be able to hoard their coins to buy one of these medals and keep it for the rest of their lives.

I would yield the rest of my time to Mr. Williams.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would have to ask you not to yield for the purpose of allowing Mr. Williams to question, because we are under a 5-minute rule, and he had almost 20 minutes, and under the new rules of the committee this year we are not supposed to yield our time to other members.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Chairman, at the same time I was questioning three witnesses, so actually if we wanted to take 5 minutes on each of these witnesses, that would be 15 minutes.

I would just like to ask one question for the record.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will let you have one question, but the committee's 5-minute rule applies in questioning all witnesses appearing as a group.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Lang can answer this for the record. It does deal with a subject that was touched on by Mr. St Germain.

On these philatelic numismatic commemoratives that we have been talking about, on page 6 of your statement, you indicate that you will use the private sector on a competitive basis for doing the work described by you.

Mr. LANG. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand that by using the private sector on a competitive basis for any work done in relationship to these commemoratives, that it will be by public bidding and that the lowest qualified bidder will get the job?

Mr. LANG. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You will sell whatever you produce or whatever is produced for you at some amount higher than the cost, so that the ARBC will be getting a profit?

Mr. LANG. Not altogether.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just answer for the record. Not altogether, I don't think is very satisfactory.

Mr. LANG. The ARBC is not going to get all of the profit, because some of the profit—although there was no decision made on it as yet—will go to the States, and others for furthering the various bicentennial programs.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I may ask, Mr. Lang, that when your transcript comes back to you for correction, you answer that a little more fully so that we will have the knowledge. Certainly you are hoping to make some money through the sale of these medals.

Mr. LANG. That is right.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It is not for private profit; it is to raise funds for the payment of moneys spent by the Commission for Bicentennial events I believe.

Mr. LANG. Madam Chairman, I would like to correct two statements, if I may. One, for the record, we have eight Members of Congress, four Congressmen and four Senators on the Commission. I previously said there were six congressional Members and you, Madam Chairman, then used that same figure. It is eight. The second one, which I think is very relevant—and it will take me only 6 seconds—is as follows:

In August 1969, which was exactly 1 month before the open hearing of the Advisory Panel—Miss Eva Adams, ex-director of the U.S. Mint, mentioned for the first time to the ARBC staff that the U.S. Mint had arranged for a philatelic numismatic combination (PNC) in connection with the opening of its Philadelphia Mint, on August 14, 1969. She suggested that ARBC might be interested in such a program, and advised that the 99 Co., headed by Mr. Baker, had produced the PNC for the mint. On the basis of Miss Adams' suggestion, the staff approached Mr. Baker for information about the PNC. It was only a couple of weeks before the panel hearings, and we wanted to get all possible knowledge and information about it, which is how it came about that Mr. Baker attended this 10-minute session. I wanted to get the reaction of the most knowledgeable panel members to this, because, for us it was a new idea and this was a perfect opportunity to do so.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If you want to enlarge upon that when you correct your transcript, please do.

Mr. LANG. I will do so.

(The following additional information was submitted for inclusion in the record at this point:)

Mr. Baker had been asked by ARBC staff to prepare some rough mock-ups of PNC's to show to the Panel as illustrative examples of possible Bicentennial PNC's. Mr. Baker distributed such PNC examples to the Panel, explained briefly



the history of PNC's, and answered questions of Panel members regarding PNC's and their feasibility for the Bicentennial.

Reference was also made to an offer by Mr. Baker to make available gratis to ARBC a patented so-called "tamper-proof" packet for holding the PNC. No commitment has been made by ARBC to Mr. Baker regarding use of such patented envelope. If the PNC program is approved, ARBC intends to follow normal Government competitive procurement procedures for letting contracts for all aspects of the program, except for production of the medals which would be by the U.S. Mint.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have just a couple of brief questions.

I think, Mr. Lang, for the record, you should submit a full list of the members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Without objection, I will insert it in the record at this point.

(The list referred to follows:)

#### AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

##### FULL COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

##### Congressional Members:

Senator Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts.  
 Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia.  
 Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire.  
 Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island.  
 Representative Harold D. Donohue of Massachusetts.  
 Representative Julia Butler Hansen of Washington.  
 Representative John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania.  
 Representative G. Wm. Whitehurst of Virginia.

##### Ex-Officio Members:

Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of State.  
 Honorable Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense.  
 Honorable John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States.  
 Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior.  
 Honorable Maurice H. Stans, Secretary of Commerce.  
 Honorable George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.  
 Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation.  
 Honorable Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.  
 Honorable L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress.  
 Honorable S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.  
 Dr. James B. Rhoads, Archivist of the United States.  
 Dr. William D. McElroy, Chairman, Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities; Director National Science Foundation.

##### Public Members:

Chairman: Mr. David J. Mahoney, New York, New York.  
 Chairman Emeritus: Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling, Office of the Chancellor, Stanford University, Stanford, California.  
 Vice-Chairman: Mr. Hobart Lewis, President and Executive Editor, Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, New York.  
 Mr. James Biddle, President, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C.  
 Mr. James S. Copley, Chairman of the Corporation, Copley Newspapers, La Jolla, California.  
 Dr. Luther H. Foster, President, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.  
 Mrs. Ann Hawkes Hutton, Bristol, Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. James E. Holshouser, Jr., Boone, North Carolina.  
 Mr. George Irwin, 428 Maine Street, Quincy, Illinois.  
 Honorable Erik Jonsson, Dallas, Texas.  
 Mr. George E. Lang, The George Lang Corporation, New York, New York.  
 Professor Richard P. McCormick, Department of History, Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.  
 Mr. Thomas W. Moore, President, Tomorrow Entertainment, Inc., New York, New York.

Mr. Clarke T. Reed, Greenville, Mississippi.  
 Mr. Frederick A. Seaton, Hastings, Nebraska.  
 Dr. Paul S. Smith, Whittier, California.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Also, could you provide us with the official report of the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals to the Commission, and also the members of that panel, so that we could have it in the record at this point.

#### AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

##### MEMBERS OF ADVISORY PANEL ON COINS AND MEDALS

Mr. George E. Lang, ARBC Commissioner—Chairman  
 Mrs. Margo Russell, Editor of "Coin World"—Vice Chairman  
 Mr. Herbert M. Bergen, President, American Numismatic Association  
 Mrs. Elvira Clain-Stefanelli, Curator, the National Museum of History and Technology  
 Dr. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli, Curator, the National Museum of History and Technology  
 Mr. Henry Grunthal, Curator of European and Modern Coins, The American Numismatic Society  
 Mr. Clifford Mishler, Editor, Numismatic News  
 Mr. Don Taxay, Flushing, New York  
 Mr. Ralph J. Menconi, Distinguished Sculptor and Creator of the Nixon Medal  
 Mr. Eric Newman, Distinguished Collector

##### From Federal Agencies:

Honorable James Conlon, Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing  
 Honorable Mary Brooks, Director of the Bureau of the Mint  
 Honorable Charls Walker, Under Secretary of the Treasury  
 Mr. Douglas MacAgy, National Endowment for the Arts

---

#### PERTINENT EXCERPTS RELATING TO MEDALS OF OFFICIAL REPORT OF PANEL TO FULL COMMISSION

##### AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

##### Recommendations of the ARBC Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals

##### COINS AND MEDALS REPORT NO. 5

[Submitted by Commissioner George E. Lang, Chairman, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, December 24, 1970]

##### *Policy statement*

Congress has directed the Commission to prepare an overall program for commemorating the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, ". . . and to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historical events that preceded and are associated with, the American Revolution."

Under this directive a professional group of numismatists was selected in 1970 and convened in plenary session as an Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals under the Chairmanship of Commissioner George E. Lang. The Panel acted to determine broad recommendations for Bicentennial numismatic commemorative programs, to be used as policy guidance for development of pertinent Commission resolutions concerning the "issuance of commemorative coins, medals, . . . , and stamps", to the President and Congress.

In making its recommendations, the Advisory Panel carefully weighed the interests of the public, the collectors, private enterprise, and the Treasury Department. All segments were queried by correspondence or hearings in its deliberations. The intent was to develop the Bicentennial numismatic program with substantial public participation, while utilizing both the prestige of government facilities and the versatility of private enterprise to serve the public needs, in the best manner possible.

The Advisory Panel recommends that ;

\* \* \* \* \*



(5) *a National Medal be struck by the U.S. Mint. It will be singularly identifiable in both obverse and reverse design as the official National Medal and be available only for the year 1976. The Medal, as approved by the Commission and with concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, will be struck in uniform sizes and of common and precious metals; (6) the State Bicentennial Commission establish State Medals for distribution to the public and that these medals be struck by private organizations; (7) an Awards Medal should be created by the Commission, struck by private industry in very limited quantities, and made of precious metals as a presentation piece in recognition of meritorious service.* the issuance of a National Medal. Some believe it is not necessary; others look for its authorization, but feel it should be struck privately.

The Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals will further convene at the request of the Chairman of the Panel to consider design, production, and distribution of coins and medals approved by the Commission, the President, and the Congress.

\* \* \* \* \*

RECOMMENDATION: THAT A NATIONAL BICENTENNIAL MEDAL BE STRUCK  
BY THE U.S. MINT

I. *Background:* Numerous precedents exist for National Medals, The Medal should be singularly identifiable in both its obverse and reverse as the National Medal commemorating American independence in 1976. The Medal, as approved by the Commission and with concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, would be struck in uniform sizes and of common and previous metals. In order that sufficient numbers of Medals are produced, the striking and stockpiling would begin an adequate period of time prior to 1976. Distribution of the Medals would probably begin no earlier than July 4, 1975, and end on or before December 31, 1983. Various outlets for the widest distribution of the Medals as possible will be surveyed and reported on for Commission approval.

II. *Agency and Group Positions:* The Treasury would gladly accept the privilege of striking the National Medal. The U.S. Mint has a long history of designing and striking National Medals. Certain members of Congress have endorsed both the concept of a National Medal and its striking by the U.S. Mint. Furthermore, the numismatic society places greater significance on official issues of National Medals produced by the U.S. Mint. The public in general, as indicated by correspondence, is seeking a National Medal. Congress has included the consideration for a Commemorative Medal in its Bicentennial legislation. Private enterprise involved in numismatics seems to reflect mixed emotions concerning the issuance of a National Medal. Some believe it is not necessary; others look for its authorization, but feel it should be struck privately.

III. *Advisory Panel Vote:* (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; page 155).

UNANIMOUS—in favor of the recommendation

IV. *Chairman's Recommendations:* National Medals have been struck for many occasions in American history, the 1876 Centennial, the Civil War Centennial, and Inaugurations, to name but a few. The Bicentennial should certainly maintain the tradition and inspire the U.S. Mint to create the finest medal possible.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT THE STATE BICENTENNIAL COMMISSIONS ESTABLISH STATE  
MEDALS FOR DISTRIBUTION TO THE PUBLIC AND THAT THEIR MEDALS BE STRUCK  
BY PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

I. *Background:* Each State Bicentennial Commission will probably establish a State Medal for 1976 portraying significant historical events or persons. Hopefully each State will wish to participate in developing a uniform standard for the production of these Medals. The Commission could promote this uniformity by withholding the imprimatur from any State which creates Medals that would not coincide with the national set.

II. *Agency and Group Positions:* The State and private sector should be encouraged to work together in developing these State Medals. Such cooperation would provide fund raising opportunities for the States and give excellent business opportunities to the private sector and finally, release the U.S. Mint for other commemorative programs.

III. *Advisory Panel Vote:* (Reference: Transcript of Proceedings Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; page 174).

UNANIMOUS—in favor of the Recommendation

IV. *Chairman's Recommendations:* The State Bicentennial Commissions are relatively free to establish their own programs, numismatic and otherwise. The Commission should take cognizance, however, of the overall size, composition, and design of each State Medal so that the public may have the opportunity of acquiring one official, uniform set. This would allow the ARBC to oversee the quality of the State Medal.

RECOMMENDATION: THAT AN AWARDS MEDAL BE CREATED BY THE COMMISSION, STRUCK BY PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN VERY LIMITED QUANTITIES AND MADE OF PRECIOUS METALS AS A PRESENTATION PIECE IN RECOGNITION OF MERITORIOUS SERVICE

I. *Background:* The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission will undoubtedly make awards for presentation to those individuals and organizations who have shown outstanding leadership and support for Bicentennial programs.

II. *Agency and Group Positions:* An Awards Medal would undoubtedly lend itself, by the nature of composition and aesthetic value, to any presentation made by the Commission. The Medal can be designed and produced by either the U.S. Mint or privately. The Awards Medal concept is purely at the discretion of the Commission.

III. *Advisory Panel Vote:* (Reference: Transcripts of Proceedings, Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, September 30, 1970; page 164).

FOR: 9, AGAINST: 7, ABSENT, 3.

IV. *Chairman's Recommendations:* The Awards Medal would fulfill a need that will soon be upon the Commission. Once the Commission imprimatur is available, it is recommended that a designer be commissioned to create the Medal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We should also have in the record, I believe, a copy of the public law creating the Commission, Public Law 89-491, and any amendments thereto, if you will provide this. The creation of the Commission was of course the legislative accomplishment of another committee of this House, the Committee on the Judiciary, and not a matter within our jurisdiction. So we would have this background.

(The text of Public Law 89-491 as amended follows:)

PUBLIC LAW 89-491 AND AMENDMENTS, LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

PUBLIC LAW 89-491 89TH CONGRESS JULY 4, 1966, AS AMENDED THROUGH JUNE 30, 1971

To establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled; That, as this Nation approaches the bicentennial of its birth and the historic events preceding and associated with the American Revolution which are of such major significance in the development of our national heritage of individual liberty, representative government, and the attainment of equal and inalienable rights and which have also had so profound an influence throughout the world, it is appropriate and desirable to provide for the observation and commemoration of this anniversary and these events through local, State, National, and international activities planned, encouraged, developed, and coordinated by a national commission, representative of appropriate public and private authorities and organizations.*

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the commemoration of the American Revolution bicentennial.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) Four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) The Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the



Interior, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Archivist of the United States, and the Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, all of whom shall be ex officio members of the Commission;

(4) Seventeen members from private life to be appointed by the President, one of whom shall be designated as the Chairman by the President.

(c) Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made.

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare an overall program for commemorating the bicentennial of the American Revolution, and to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historic events that preceded, and are associated with, the American Revolution.

(b) In preparing its plans and programs, the Commission shall give due consideration to any related plans and programs developed by State, local, and private groups, and it may designate special committees with representatives from such bodies to plan, develop, and coordinate specific activities.

(c) In all planning, the Commission shall give special emphasis to the ideas associated with the Revolution which have been so important in the development of the United States, in world affairs and in mankind's quest for freedom.

(d) Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President a comprehensive report incorporating its specific recommendations for the commemoration of the bicentennial and related events. This report may recommend activities such as, but not limited to, the following:

(1) the production, publication, and distribution of books, pamphlets, films, and other educational materials focusing on the history, culture, and political thought of the period of the American Revolution;

(2) bibliographical and documentary projects and publications;

(3) conferences, convocations, lectures, seminars, and other programs;

(4) the development of libraries, museums, historic sites, and exhibits, including mobile exhibits;

(5) ceremonies and celebrations commemorating specific events;

(6) programs and activities focusing on the national and international significance of the American Revolution, and its implications for present and future generations;

(7) the issuance of commemorative coins, medals, certificates of recognition, and stamps.

(e) The report of the Commission shall include recommendations for the allocation of financial and administrative responsibility among the public and private authorities and organizations recommended for participation by the Commission. The report shall also include proposals for such legislative enactments and administrative actions as the Commission considers necessary to carry out its recommendations. The President shall transmit the Commission's report to Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation and such report of administrative actions taken by him as he deems appropriate.

Sec. 4. (a) In fulfilling its responsibilities, the Commission is authorized and directed to consult, cooperate with, and seek advice and assistance from appropriate Federal departments and agencies, State and local public bodies, learned societies, and historical, patriotic, philanthropic, civic, professional, and related organizations. Such Federal departments and agencies are authorized and requested to cooperate with the Commission in planning, encouraging, developing, and coordinating appropriate commemorative activities.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and requested to undertake a study of appropriate actions which might be taken to further preserve and develop Revolutionary War historic sites and battlefields, at such time and in such manner as will insure that fitting observances and exhibits may be held at appropriate sites and battlefields during the bicentennial celebration. The Secretary shall submit the results of his study to the Commission, together with his recommendations, in time to afford the Commission an opportunity to review his study, and to incorporate such of its findings and recommendations as the Commission may deem appropriate in the report provided for in section 3(d).

(c) The Chairman of the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities are authorized and requested to cooperate with the Commission, especially in the encouragement and coordination of scholarly works and presentations focusing on the history, culture, and political thought of the Revolutionary War period.

(d) The Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist of the United States are authorized and requested to cooperate with the Commission, especially in the development and display of exhibits and collections, and in the development of bibliographies, catalogs, and other materials relevant to the period of the Revolutionary War.

(e) Each of the officers listed in subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall submit recommendations to the Commission in time to afford the Commission an opportunity to review them, and to incorporate such of the recommendations as the Commission may deem appropriate in the report provided for in section 3(d).

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services.

(b) All books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other materials relating to the Revolutionary War period and donated to the Commission may be deposited for preservation in National, State, or local libraries or museums or be otherwise disposed of by the Commission in consultation with the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Archivist of the United States, and the Administrator of General Services.

Sec. 6. (a) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such. Members from the legislative and executive branches shall be allowed necessary travel expenses as authorized under law for official travel. Those appointed from private life shall be allowed necessary travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2).

(b) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable and to appoint such advisory committees as it deems necessary.

(c) The Commission may procure services as authorized by section 3109 of Title 5, United States Code.

(d) The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may procure supplies, services, and property; make contracts; expend in furtherance of this Act funds appropriated, donated, or received in pursuance of contracts hereunder, and exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this Act.

(e) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting personnel and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the Department of the Interior, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the regulations of the Department of the Interior for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Secretary of the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *And provided further*, That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(f) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon its termination may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the National Park Service, or may be disposed of as excess or surplus property.

(g) Whoever, except as authorized under rules and regulations issued by the Commission, knowingly manufactures, reproduces, or uses any logos, symbols, or marks originated under authority of and certified by the Commission for use in connection with the commemoration of the American Revolution Bicentennial, or any facsimile thereof, or in such a manner as suggests any such logos, symbols, or marks, shall be fined not more than \$250 or imprisoned not more than six months or both: *Provided*, That this section shall be applicable upon publication in the Federal Register of notification of certification hereunder by the Commission with respect to each such logo, symbol, or mark.

Sec. 7. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$670.00 for the period through fiscal year 1971.



(b) An annual report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress. A final report shall be made to the Congress no later than December 31, 1983, upon which date the Commission shall terminate.

Approved July 4, 1966:

As amended by PL 90-187, approved December 12, 1967; PL 91-84, approved October 10, 1969; and PL 91-528, approved December 7, 1970. PL 92-34, approved June 30, 1971.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Now, my first question to you, Mr. Lang, is this.

How much money do you hope to raise through the medal and stamp program, and how does the Commission intend to use those funds? If you would answer just briefly on that, then you could elaborate when you correct your transcript.

Mr. LANG. Madam Chairman, I am not trying to be evasive, but I would rather not give you any supposed facts, and supposed figures, at this time. But we will submit to you very shortly a complete answer on this, which is based on available facts.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If you would do that, I would appreciate it, because I would rather have the facts than your guess right now.

(The following information was submitted for inclusion in the record at this point:)

#### ESTIMATE OF ARBC REVENUES FROM MEDALS AND STAMP PROGRAM

The Commission has no valid estimates at this time of potential revenues from medals and stamp programs. Insofar as PNC's are concerned, annual gross revenues are estimated in a range from \$400,000 to \$2,000,000 per year, based on an increasing yearly acceptance over a five year period.

Development and implementation of the PNC program will, of course, be the responsibility of the full Commission, taking into account any legislative proposals which may be developed by the Congress under the aegis of the various committees which have jurisdiction over the Commission.

Similarly, revenues resulting from sales will be available to the Commission, to the extent authorized by law and as determined by Commission policy, for funding appropriate Bicentennial programs undertaken by the several States as well as by local communities and patriotic and service organizations. The Commission membership includes four Senators and four Congressmen who will participate in the development of Commission policy on revenues and oversee its implementation.

Mr. Lang, I want to ask you, have you seen the advertisement of the Franklin Mint appearing yesterday in the Washington Star?

Mr. LANG. Yes, I have.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Offering a numismatic philatelic combination similar to the one you plan?

Mr. LANG. Yes, I have.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Do you think this conflicts with, or competes with, or makes unnecessary, the medals you are asking us to authorize under H.R. 7987?

Mr. LANG. I am not appearing as a private citizen, here, and I hope I have the right to answer only part of the question. I am appearing on behalf of the ARBC and its executive committee, and as the chairman of the coins and medals panel. The answer which I would like to give you is that this advertisement in the New York Times by the Franklin Mint this past Sunday will not make this bill unnecessary, or the philatelic numismatic combination to be produced by the ARBC and the U.S. Mint and the U.S. Postal Service.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It will not make this bill unnecessary?

Mr. LANG. No.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The only thing I really question in this advertisement is the reference to its being the official medallic first-day-of-issue cover. I don't know if the use of the word "official" would make this misleading. I think if you, and Mr. Dickey, and Mrs. Brooks, will also consider that and let us have your opinion in writing on it, whether the word "official" used by a private mint would give a wrong interpretation, we would appreciate it.

(The following statement was subsequently submitted for inclusion in the record at this point:)

USE OF WORD "OFFICIAL" IN ADVERTISEMENT OF THE FRANKLIN MINT/POSTMASTERS OF AMERICA

The ARBC is of the opinion that the use of the word "official" in the Franklin Mint advertisement for medallic first day covers (Sunday, Washington Star, June 27) would be misleading to the general public.

However, the question whether such advertising misrepresents the nature of the products within the purview of various statutory provisions must be referred for decision to the Federal Trade Commission and perhaps the Postal Service. In such connection, the Federal Trade Commission can also consider whether the advertising fulfills the spirit and intent of the Franklin Mint Assurance of Voluntary Compliance No. 1851 approved by the FTC on November 24, 1969 (copy attached).

The Postal Service has advised that neither the Postmaster General, the Post Office Department nor the new Postal Service has approved the Franklin Mint PNC program.

Congressional intent expressed in P.L. 89-491, as amended, would appear to anticipate that ARBC would assume responsibility for designating certain artifacts and events as official by means of certificates of recognition or other means.

THE FRANKLIN MINT,  
Yeadon, Pa., August 29, 1969.

Re: The Franklin Mint, Inc., File No. 692 3062, Assurance of Voluntary Compliance.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am President and Chief Executive Officer of The Franklin Mint, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as The Franklin Mint), a publicly held company duly incorporated in and by virtue of the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on July 22, 1964, and which prior to June 1, 1968 was named General Numismatics Corporation. The company for more than the past year has maintained and presently maintains its principal place of business at 456 Penn Street, Yeadon Industrial Park, Yeadon, Pennsylvania 19050.

The principal business of the company is the design, manufacture and sale of privately issued coins, medals, and tokens, produced in precious and non-precious metals. It also produces fine art plaques in silver, and to a limited extent, other related products. In 1968, its sales exceeded \$10 million; in the first six months of 1969, its sales amounted to approximately \$13 million.

The Franklin Mint sells its products to individual purchasers, commemorative societies, commercial customers, and foreign governments. A description of the manner by which sales are made has previously been submitted to the Commission. In general, sales are solicited through the use of nationwide advertising and direct-mail promotions.

The staff of the Federal Trade Commission has questioned certain representations in an effort to determine whether or not The Franklin Mint, in offering its products to the general purchasing public, may have misrepresented the nature of its products, or in using the name The Franklin Mint may have implied an affiliation with the Federal Government or any agency thereof, by or through the use of:

(a) the word "Mint" in its trade name "The Franklin Mint" which appears in its national advertising;



- (b) the word "coin" in describing or identifying certain of its products;
- (c) a facsimile of the "Great Seal of the United States" inscribed on the reverse side of a medal known as "American Fighting Men Coin-Medal";
- (d) the statement "America's Only Publicly-Owned Private Mint", which appeared in a few of its advertising brochures.

In view of the questions raised by the staff of the Federal Trade Commission, The Franklin Mint agrees to the following:

(a) The company will, in its promotional materials and advertisements offering its products for sale, prominently display the name and address of the company and

(i) in the case of letters used in connection promotional mailings offering its products for sale, print in a clear and conspicuous manner at the bottom of the first page of the letter a statement that the Franklin Mint is not affiliated with the United States Mint or any other governmental agency,

(ii) in the case of all other promotional material and advertisements offering its products for sale, print in a clear and conspicuous manner adjacent to its name and address a statement emphasizing the fact that the Franklin Mint is a private mint and is not affiliated with the United States Mint or other governmental agency; and in the event that said statement does not appear immediately adjacent to the subscription or order form in said promotional material or advertisements, then the statement that The Franklin Mint is not affiliated with the United States Mint or any other governmental agency will be repeated within the subscription or order form itself.

(b) The company will, in its promotional materials and advertisements, when offering non-monetary coins for sale and describing them with the word "coin",

(i) consistently conform to the practice of qualifying the word, either by using the word as part of a composite (e.g., "mini-coin") or by preceding it with an appropriate qualifier (e.g., "antique *cor* coin") to avoid an erroneous impression that monetary coins are being offered,

(ii) affirmatively disclose in the body of the promotional material or advertisement that the coins offered are not monetary coins, and

(iii) print clearly and conspicuously in the subscription form or order form appearing in the promotional material or advertisement a statement that the coins are not monetary coins.

(c) The company will in no way reproduce or design any likeness or facsimile of the "Great Seal of the United States" unless specific authorization is obtained from the proper authority of the Government of the United States.

(d) The company has, on or about September 30, 1968, discontinued using the statement "America's Only Publicly-Owned Private Mint" in its promotional materials and advertisements and will not resume use of same.

It is understood that the statements and assurances herein are made for settlement purposes only and are submitted pursuant to Rule 2.21 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure. They do not constitute an admission by The Franklin Mint that any of its acts or practices are unlawful.

The Franklin Mint will, if this assurance is accepted by the Commission, distribute or circulate a copy of same to each of its officers, directors, and persons in charge of its departments. Record proof of such circulation or distribution will be maintained for Commission examination.

The company understands this assurance of voluntary compliance does not bind nor obligate the Federal Trade Commission in any way to its action in this matter.

The Franklin Mint agrees that, within six months after notification by the Commission that this assurance of voluntary compliance has been accepted, the company will certify and report to the Commission the measures taken in compliance with this assurance and, for a period of one year after such notification, the company will submit to the Commission copies of all its advertising and promotional materials.

JOSEPH M. SEGEL,  
*Individually and as President*  
*of the Franklin Mint, Inc.*

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of August, 1969.

CATHERINE D. HESPE, *Notary Public*

In and for the County of Delaware, State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DICKEY. We will submit a statement on that question.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank you all for coming. I didn't expect us to take this much time with you, but obviously the members had many points to raise. Thank you very much for your assistance to us in the consideration of this administration measure.

Mr. LANG. Thank you very much.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We will insert a letter from Chairman Patman to the chairman of the Bicentennial Commission.

(The letter referred to follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,  
*Ninety-first Congress, Washington, D.C., October 1, 1970.*

HON. DAVID J. MAHONEY,  
*Chairman, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission,  
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MAHONEY: The observance of the 200th anniversary of the formation of the United States of America will be an event of such great significance to the people of our country that it should certainly be commemorated numismatically in a form reflective of the importance of the occasion. It has been brought to my attention, as Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over legislation dealing with such matters, that consideration is being given in the Commission to proposals for having either commemorative or other coins or national medals, or other numismatic materials struck by the Mint as part of the official participation by the Department of the Treasury, on behalf of the American people, in the Bicentennial programs.

While it has been the policy of this Committee for many years not to authorize the striking of special coins of a design different from those of the regular circulating coins, and I believe this is also the official position of the Treasury, we would certainly be willing to give careful consideration to any proposals from the Bicentennial Commission for legislation authorizing either a new series of circulating coins or of special commemorative coins minted in limited quantity (but in adequate volume to meet the demand from the public) to mark our 200th national anniversary. And, of course, we would also be willing to consider proposals for the striking of national medals to mark this occasion, under such terms and conditions as the Bicentennial Commission might recommend.

It is my firm opinion that numismatic materials created by the Bicentennial Commission as part of this great national observance should be approved by the Congress and should be made in the Mint as U.S. coins or as national medals, either to be sold directly to the public by the Mint or by the Bicentennial Commission in a manner which will assure an opportunity to every citizen to obtain copies or sets of all issues.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
*Chairman.*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Next we will call officials of two of the State Bicentennial Commissions, Rhode Island State Representative George F. McDonald who is also chairman of the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission, and until this weekend, I believe, was the chairman of the Bicentennial Council of the Original Thirteen States, and accompanying him is Mr. Richard F. Gibbs of Raleigh, N.C., executive secretary of the North Carolina Bicentennial Commission, who is the newly designated chairman of the Bicentennial Council of the Original Thirteen States, succeeding Representative McDonald.

Unfortunately, it was not possible for these witnesses to submit their statements in advance, because I understand the policy which they will espouse was just determined over the weekend at a meeting of the council in Williamsburg. Since we do not have advance copies, we are not



sure of what position you are planning to take. So you may proceed, gentlemen, recognizing that the presentations are to be brief, because we are holding all of our witnesses to a time limitation.

I would like to have Congressman St Germain, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, introduce his constituent, Representative McDonald. We are delighted that you could be here this morning, Congressman St Germain.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I appreciate your courtesy, since I am not on the subcommittee.

But as you so clearly stated, he is the chairman of the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission, and until last week, he has been chairman of the council. He is a very close friend and an old friend. When I was a member of the legislature, formerly—and we hate to talk of this—and he was a member of the press, even then we were friendly.

But he has done a very outstanding job to date working with the commission of Rhode Island, with no funds, so to speak. We in the Rhode Island Bicentennial, like the bicentennials of many States, are without funds. But despite this, he has carried on an excellent job. I am proud to have him before the committee this morning.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you. It is good to have your introduction.

Now, we will call on Representative McDonald first to briefly tell us his position on this bill, and then we will hear Mr. Gibbs.

#### STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. McDONALD, CHAIRMAN, RHODE ISLAND BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. McDONALD. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Thank you, Congressman St Germain, for that marvelous plug. As the Congressman said, I am a reformed newspaperman, and I can appreciate the fact that the committee wanted advance texts. Unfortunately, because of the policymaking decision which we made over the weekend in Williamsburg at a meeting of the Bicentennial Council of the Original Thirteen States, complicated by a breakdown of the press this morning, we were not able to get you my official statement. However, that will be presented to the committee later on this afternoon. I do beg your kind indulgence.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you. It will be put in the record in full.

Mr. McDONALD. I will speak, then, as they say, off the cuff. I would like to make several points, if I may.

I listened to the testimony here this morning. I will tell you that by and large, the bicentennial council, which is the original 13 States, and the bicentennial commissions of at least the 13 States—I cannot speak for the other States in the Union—were not consulted by the ARBC or its subcommittee on coins and medallions as to what the States desired in the way of coins, commemorative, and medallions.

We do have some misgivings about the pending legislation, although my statement as submitted to you will by and large support H.R. 7987 with a proposed amendment.

This amendment was in concurrence with David Mahoney, who is chairman of the ARBC. He met with us this past weekend in Williamsburg.

After reflecting upon the legislation and giving it careful consideration, after we met in Williamsburg, I find that there is a contradiction, I believe, in the bill. Section 2 says that there will be one national medal. Section 4 says that the other medals shall be deemed to be national medals under the public law, which means that the commission will be allowed to issue up to 14 national medals. I believe that is a contradiction. I bring that to your attention. I hope it will be corrected before the legislation passes.

I believe that if there is to be a national medal, that there should be one national medal. There should not be some confusion with 14 national medals.

Now, I for one believe that the proper way to celebrate the 200th anniversary in the medallic field would be to use the coins of the realm. I would hope that you would give that consideration. I believe the best way to do that would be perhaps to use a half dollar, or the 25-cent piece, using the Federal seal, the great seal of this country, on the obverse side, and the seal of the individual State, each of the 50 States on the reverse. I think that would probably be the best way.

I will tell you, Madam Chairman, and Congressmen, that it would be my impression, after meeting this past weekend with Mr. Mahoney his reflection upon the beliefs of the original 13 States is that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission would not engage in any programs that would develop in competition with the State programs. This particular program as developed under this proposed legislation would, I believe, establish that competition.

I will say to you, Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, that we in the State of Rhode Island, because of the fiscal situation in our State, do not look forward to any funds from our legislature in the next year to carry on our program. We must, if we are to make a successful celebration in Rhode Island, go to the private sector for funds. Now, we will have to solicit outright donations, and we are going to have to get involved in other programs that will raise revenue for our individual commissions and for the bicentennial council as a group. We are presently negotiating with two private firms in this area. We intend to enter into a contract with them jointly and severally as the 13 as a way to raise funds for our particular State and the council as a whole.

I am very fearful that unless some very stringent language is put into this bill, that we will meet severe competition on the national level.

One of the things that bothers me greatly in this piece of legislation is the fact that there will be no control over the striking of the award medal, and that all of the medals will be marketed by an unnamed private concern which, according to the previous testimony, would be open to public bidding.

I also heard the questions by Congressman Williams concerning a Mr. Baker, who apparently has a PNC-type of packaging. He met in executive session with the medallic subcommittee. I had never heard that until this morning, and I raise serious questions, as to what may be occurring in that particular area.

I would ask you, Madam Chairman and members of this subcommittee, to make sure that the States are adequately protected when



this legislation is going through the stages of being revised. We have no provisions in here for any price structure, and there are no adequate safeguards in that area.

I heard Mrs. Brooks testify that there would be millions of these medals sold, and that the price to the ARBC would be at cost, and that the profit from these medals would be inuring to the benefit of some private corporation that would be distributing them. I submit to you, Madam Chairman, and I submit to you members of this panel, that any profit that is derived from any coins should go directly to the States, because without such revenues, we will be unable to plan and bring to fruition our individual State programs.

If the bicentennial celebration of the United States of America is to truly be a grassroots celebration, it must come from the States, and it cannot come from dictatorial dictation from the national level. It must flow up and not flow down. And as I pointed out earlier, we have had virtually no contact whatsoever with the ARBC. Our positions and our opinions have never been solicited. We have had virtually no contact except for this past weekend, and I believe that it was with some reluctance that this came. I hope that in the future, this is going to be relieved. I am sure that we may be able to work together. I am hoping that we are going to be able to work together. I think it may be due to a misunderstanding of minds. But if we are to work together, the opinions of the States must be taken into consideration, and I think it should start at this point. We are willing and able to work with the ARBC. We want to carry out our State programs. We are looking for assistance. I think the assistance should begin with this particular bill.

Thank you very kindly for your time.

(The prepared statement subsequently submitted for the record by Rhode Island State Representative McDonald follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE F. McDONALD OF RHODE ISLAND, CHAIRMAN, RHODE ISLAND BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

My name is George F. McDonald of Rhode Island. I am a state representative in the General Assembly and serve as chairman of the Rhode Island State Bicentennial Committee. Additionally, I have served during the past year as chairman of the Bicentennial Council of the 13 Original States—which organization represents the bicentennial agencies in those states.

The Bicentennial Council met this past weekend at Williamsburg, Virginia. At this meeting the group formally approved by-laws which were signed by the representatives of the state bicentennial agencies. I am sure that it will be helpful to this committee to understand some of the purposes of this Council.

I would like to quote directly from the by-laws of this Bicentennial Council to give you an indication of the reasons that we have joined together to work on joint projects and activities relating to the celebration of our country's 200th anniversary.

"To explore and develop ways in which the Bicentennial agencies of the original 13 states may share with each other and with all of the 50 states of the union ideas, methods, programs, and activities directed toward the goal of broadening the public's understanding of the importance of and the need for participation in the forthcoming commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

"To cooperate with the ARBC in activities involving the original 13 states and to assist in liaison relationships between the Commission and the individual state Bicentennial agencies."

It was our pleasure to have in attendance at the meeting in Williamsburg, Mr. David J. Mahoney, chairman of the ARBC. It is no secret to say that some of us

feel that the states have not been consulted enough by the ARBC in its development of plans and projects. However, we received the assurance of Mr. Mahoney that the complaints that we expressed to him would be resolved in future dealings of the ARBC with the states.

Of particular interest to this committee is the medallic legislation of the ARBC. After our discussions with Mr. Mahoney, the Bicentennial Council agreed not to oppose this legislation provided that the ARBC program is not designed or promoted in any way that will conflict or compete with any of the commemorative medal programs of the states or the Bicentennial Council.

Toward this end the Bicentennial Council unanimously moved the adoption of the following resolution:

That H.R. 7987 be amended by adding the following language herein to Section Six (6).

"In fulfilling its responsibilities herewith, the Commission shall consult, cooperate with and seek advice and assistance from State Bicentennial agencies in accordance with Section 4(a) of Public Law 89-491."

This amendment was agreed to by Mr. Mahoney who said that the ARBC would seek the approval of the Bicentennial Council and the states with regard to the content of their programs before the ARBC embarks on any of its medallic programs.

The ARBC's medallic program is of concern to us since we—the Bicentennial Council—will soon present our first series of commemorative medals that will feature the signers of the Declaration of Independence and which will be minted and marketed by the Franklin Mint.

We certainly do not want the ARBC to move ahead with any program or programs that will hinder the efforts of the individual states or the Bicentennial Council from raising money from private sources.

In closing I would like to say, speaking as chairman of the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission, that I would like to see the ARBC limit its medals program to one medal—which then could truly be constituted as a national medal.

I also feel that the language of the resolution adopted by the Bicentennial Council in Williamsburg probably falls short of its true intent—namely to assure the Bicentennial Council and the individual states protection from ARBC infringement in areas in which the states are developing their own programs.

I want to thank the members of this committee for the opportunity to appear before you and to express these views.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Gibbs.

**STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. GIBBS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,  
NORTH CAROLINA AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL  
COMMISSION, AND CHAIRMAN, BICENTENNIAL COUNCIL OF THE  
ORIGINAL THIRTEEN STATES**

Mr. GIBBS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Let me say that I am most grateful for the opportunity to be heard. I will try to reciprocate your courtesy and be as brief as possible.

I am sorry we weren't able to get the prepared statements to you before this morning, but I presume that you have it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It will be made a part of the record.

Mr. GIBBS. I will, then, try not to duplicate much of what Mr. McDonald has said, although as a matter of fact, he has touched on most of the major points.

It occurs to me that succinctly what we are here to do is not to oppose a bill, because it is obvious that the national commission should strike some sort of a national medal. It is rather our concern to ask you to provide adequate safeguards for the interests of the States.



It would seem really unfortunate that we should have to make an issue of asking the Congress to provide safeguards for the States against an administrative agency of the Federal Government. But nevertheless our experience has unhappily been, as Mr. McDonald already has alluded to, that our interests are apparently given a perfunctory attention by the national commission.

The record will show that the North Carolina Commission has since its conception consistently and persistently attempted to establish close working relationships with the national commission, with, I regret to say, virtually no success. It is not a unique situation. Every commission within the original 13, stretching across the United States, with whom I am in contact, reports the same sort of unresponsiveness.

It is not my position here to call names, but simply to point out to you why we are concerned about asking you for protection in this bill.

Now, we have been assured verbally on a number of occasions by Mr. Mahoney and by key members of his staff that they envision no program whatever which will operate to the detriment of a State program.

Such simply hasn't been the case. That is outlined in the prepared statement.

But it is our conviction, based upon our experience, that we do need your protection.

We call your attention to Public Law 89-4921, sections 3(b) and 4(a), which seem to us clearly to stress the intent of Congress that the States shall have a substantive input into national programs. Thus far we have not had that input. We would like in this legislation to have an amendment in such language that it would insure that the States—and by that I don't just mean the 13, but the 50 States of this Union—have a substantive voice in the determination of the size, of the content, and of the nature in general of these medals, which will presumably belong to all Americans.

Secondly, I would like to urge that this committee give very serious consideration to the possibility that a commemorative medals program on a substantial scale, as I understand the national one is, could seriously compromise if not destroy one of the few revenue sources open to State bicentennial commissions.

Mr. McDonald has already spoken to you about the position of the Rhode Island Commission. I can inform you that when the appropriations bill was reported out of the North Carolina General Assembly last week, it contained not one dime for the Bicentennial Commission. I can confirm that this is true of the State of New Hampshire. I can confirm that this is true of most States. In those States which have appropriations, the appropriations are token only. Most of them cover such things as housekeeping and barely cover the size of a staff. I don't really lament this too much, because it has occurred to me that in commemorating the history of the American people, surely self-reliance is one of the major attributes of our people throughout our history. So it is, that I find that my people are willing to shoulder the burden alone. Frankly, we don't feel that we have to come to Washington for money to operate our programs. It seems to us that if a bicentennial program is worth operating at all, it is worth the people

doing it. I have said at the grassroots level on several occasions when I would go out to talk to my people, and they would say, Mr. Gibbs, what sort of Federal funds are going to be available, I have said, thank God, none. Doesn't your country mean enough to you that you can give something?

I am happy to report to this committee that the reaction to that has been the most favorable. The people frankly have forgotten, some of them, how to help themselves, and the idea has once again become rather novel and appealing. I find it particularly true among the young people. So, for example, one county in North Carolina in a 5-week period last month raised \$25,000 for a historical project. They didn't ask the State for a dime. This is what we are driving for, to make sure our programs stand on their own feet, so that they, in the fullest sense of the word, are a product of the American people, rather than having the American people sit as a small boy in a barber-shop and get a haircut, they are going to do something for themselves, and they should be urged to do something for themselves. This country is ready to make this sacrifice that Mr. Kennedy asked of us 10 years ago.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Gibbs follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. GIBBS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE NORTH CAROLINA AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BICENTENNIAL COUNCIL OF THE THIRTEEN ORIGINAL STATES

Madame Chairman and Members of the Committee: We are grateful for this opportunity to be heard on a matter of quite substantive concern, not only to the bicentennial programs of the thirteen original States, but also to every State in the Union. I will try to reciprocate your courtesy by being as brief as possible.

Succinctly, our concern with H.R. 7987 is to ask that the bill be so amended and enacted as to protect what we regard as the vital interests of the States. Let me make it quite clear that we do not oppose the desire of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to have a commemorative medals program. We would, however, oppose, as we clearly must, any Federal program which would pre-empt or substantially compromise or injure State programs.

Ordinarily, perhaps, State agencies should not have to be apprehensive that Federal agencies will pursue courses of action detrimental to that of the States. Nevertheless, we would be derelict in our duty to our States if we did not keep a close watch for such possibilities; and, in a larger sense, we would also be derelict in our loyalty to the principles of constitutional federalism upon which this Nation was founded and in commemoration of which founding we find our reason to exist.

I regret, deeply, that we find it necessary to bring to the attention of this committee and the Congress that the history of the relations between our State commissions and the ARBC has been markedly unsatisfactory and has given rise to a conviction that any legislation enacted by the Congress ought to be drawn and enacted with stringent safeguards for the interests of the States. We wish to draw to your attention, and to emphasize, two sections of Public Law 89-491, the joint resolution of Congress which established the ARBC and defined its functions and duties. Section 3(b) and Section 4(a) seem to make it clear beyond any reasonable rebuttal that the intent of Congress was that the ARBC should enter into genuine consultation with the State bicentennial commissions in the formulation of plans for the national bicentennial commemoration. Surely this would include consultation with the States in preparing legislation which would necessarily affect their programs. The fact of the matter is that this simply has not been done. In no case of which we are aware has the ARBC consulted with State commissions on any of the legislative proposals they have offered to the Congress. It was, in fact, primarily due to the unresponsiveness of the ARBC to individual State bicentennial commissions that the Bicentennial Council was formed. The justification for feelings of deep frustra-



tion and suspicion of the ARBC by States commissions has been freely admitted by Mr. David Mahoney, chairman of the ARBC, and by key members of his staff. They have offered, not as an excuse, but as a mitigating circumstance, the fact that they are understaffed and underfunded and have simply not been able to establish effective communications as they desire. Frankly, it is a great temptation to accept this explanation. I think most people want to think well of others, because no one really wants the additional burden of having to suspect the motives and intentions of people with whom they *must* work and with whom they *wish* to cooperate. However, certain events have combined to cause us to continue to maintain a certain degree of apprehension toward the ARBC.

So, for instance, at the invitation of a committee of the Bicentennial Council Mr. Mahoney agreed to attend a meeting of the Council at Williamsburg on the 25th of this month, in an effort to establish more harmonious relations between the national and state commissions. Let me emphasize that Mr. Mahoney's attendance at this meeting was at the instance of the Council. Despite this, shortly before the meeting Mr. Mahoney wrote to each of the governors of the thirteen states informing them of the meeting and clearly implying that the meeting was simply one of a series of meetings being conducted by the ARBC. The very existence of the Bicentennial Council as an organization was ignored.

Additionally, when I returned to my office on Monday morning after the Williamsburg meeting, there was on my desk a news release from the ARBC concerning the Williamsburg meeting. This release, which had been mailed apparently on Friday, was written in the same vein, i.e., its apparent intention was to convey that the meeting of the Bicentennial Council was a meeting under the sponsorship of the ARBC. Again, there was what seems clearly a calculated omission of reference to the Council by name. In neither case were any state bicentennial officials informed prior to release. In the case of the news release, we regard this as more serious, because over a three day period during which there was ample time to show us a copy, no mention was made to us of any plans of this nature. I must inform this committee that we regard this as evidence of bad faith on the part of the ARBC, especially since the matter of failure to communicate with the states consumed a major portion of the discussion with the ARBC people at Williamsburg. The way we see it is that even while they were promising better and more open communications, they were concealing from us a news release which they had excellent reason to believe we would oppose as being deceptive.

I could go on, but I hope my point for emphasis is clear. We urge this committee to recommend legislation which will guarantee the protection of the interests of the states. It is our conviction that this is necessary because it is our conviction that the ARBC cannot be relied upon to do it voluntarily. We have received assurances of cooperation many times, but, in our judgment, these assurances have failed to develop into substantive action. It had been the inclination in Williamsburg, after talks with Mr. Mahoney and his staff, to go even more than the second mile. We were willing to let bygones be bygones. But in view of what I regard as deliberate deception in the matter of the Williamsburg news release, I must reluctantly relinquish this position and return to the one which I regard as incumbent upon me as a matter of duty. Therefore, I give you an opinion which I would prefer not to hold, but which circumstances dictate that I must express: Honest men are kept honest by padlocks. I urge you to keep the ARBC honest by appropriate legislative strictures. If you decline to provide these assurances to the states, we frankly do not believe that our opinions, ideas, advice, and interests will be given more than perfunctory regard by the ARBC.

We would also strongly urge that this committee give serious thought to the possibility that a commemorative medals program by the ARBC and the U.S. Mint could pre-empt or seriously damage similar programs now being planned by the states. It is, of course, an unarguable fact that the states with very limited investment resources cannot hope to compete in the market with the capital and organization of the federal government. Yet we must ask you to consider that we are depending heavily on revenues to be derived from the sale of commemorative medals for the funding of our commission programs. All, or virtually all of us, are under no illusions about obtaining adequate funding from state legislatures. The money simply is not there, and the prospects of its being there later on are slim, indeed. We have come to the pragmatic position that if we are to have viable and worthwhile programs for the bicentennial, the money will have to come from our own efforts. We do not lament this, particularly, because, frankly,

we believe we can meet the challenge. We have already moved to begin meeting it. Individual states, as well as the Bicentennial Council, have already moved well into negotiations with private enterprise, looking toward funding their bicentennial operations through their own initiative and effort. The area of commemorative medals is the most promising of all from our viewpoint. We respectfully ask, and urge, that the Congress take due notice of our efforts to be as self-sufficient as possible. We ask, in this connection, that the Congress be very cautious in enacting any legislation which might have a tendency to undercut these efforts at self-help.

We have received, it is only fair to say, assurances from Mr. Mahoney and his staff that they do not plan any medals program which would have a tendency to hurt state medals programs. We have been told that they do not plan to strike more than thirteen medals and will probably strike no more than six. We have also been told that these medals will only be offered for sale through a selective mailing list of known purchasers of medals struck by the U.S. Mint. We have been told that the ARBC intends to distribute revenues realized from the sale of these medals to the states for use in implementing bicentennial programs. I say we have been *told* all this. We must observe, however, that H.R. 7987, is silent on all these points. If the ARBC is acting in good faith in giving us all these verbal assurances to obtain our support for this bill, I would hope they would have no objection to having these assurances, as well as the one assuring an effective state voice in determining the nature of the medals, written into the bill itself. The bill, as introduced, provides no limits and no safeguards for the states, and I must forcefully, if reluctantly, state to this committee that our experience with the ARBC staff indicates that their expressed intentions represent no safeguards whatever to us.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I recognize clearly that you, as Members of Congress, have the difficult task of simultaneously protecting both the national interests and your individual state interests. I would not ask you to sacrifice the interests of either for the other. The record will show that I have consistently worked to promote a national viewpoint toward the bicentennial. The record of the Bicentennial Council will show that our member states have also demonstrated concern that the bicentennial be thoroughly national in scope. So I am not here to ask for special favor to be shown North Carolina or the original thirteen states. I do ask, and fervently, that you insure a strong national bicentennial program by helping to insure strong state bicentennial programs. In final summary, we ask for the protection of our interests by Congress because we feel we have good reason to apprehend that our interests will not otherwise be protected at all.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Gibbs and Mr. McDonald, this bill does not call for any medals for the States; this bill calls for a national medal. In addition to the national medal, it calls for a maximum of 13 medals—each of a different design—to commemorate specific historical events of importance. Now, what I would like to know is, what is the amendment that you have suggested, what would it do?

Mr. McDONALD. Madam Chairman, may I say to you that in the explanation of this particular bill which was sent to the various States by the ARBC, which you do not have before you—I would like to read one particular section which is entitled: "A State Medal: A State medal authorized by each State shall be struck by private mints in cooperation with the Commission to assure uniform size, composition and design to result in an official matching set of medals of all States."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. This is to be done and authorized by the State. The State doesn't have to do anything if it doesn't want to; does it?

Mr. McDONALD. But if we do, we must do it along the guidelines established by the ARBC.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I don't know what the rapport has been between the State bicentennial groups and the national commission. Certainly there should be a meeting of minds. I don't believe that it is their



intention from my knowledge of this, that they would dictate to you but rather that they would want some coordination so that there is some unity or correlation and so that there isn't just a conglomeration of different types and sizes by all the various groups. But, there ought to be a meeting of the minds and discussion of appropriate things as between the national commission and the various State commissions.

Is it your understanding that the national commission expects to contract for any of the State medals?

Mr. McDONALD. No, that is not my understanding.

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Chairman, my concern here—and I think it was reinforced by Mrs. Brooks' testimony this morning when she gave us her professional opinion which I will accept, that she anticipated sales to run in the millions. This, it seems to me is going to make terrific inroads in the market, on which the States are heavily dependent, if indeed it does not saturate that market.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But this would be for the national medal. The national medal would be different in design, I am sure, from the State medals. And then these other 13 that they mentioned—commemorating 13 specific historical events—would again be different from the State medals. From the private information I have had from some of the Commission members, I believe that they hope that a person would be able to buy the medals in the national series—whatever they might want of the historic events—and then their own State medals, at reasonable prices, and that they should have a variation in medals so that people could buy according to what they wanted or what they felt they could spend. This is my understanding.

Mr. McDONALD. Madam Chairman, I can only reiterate that in the consideration and in the preparation of this legislation by the ARBC, none of the States were consulted, nor were their opinions solicited. What you have before you is merely the consensus of opinion, as I understand it, of staff members of the ARBC, and also their commissioners and their subcommittee on medallions. We in the States were not consulted.

When we consider the national medallion, I will again point to your section 4 of that bill, which says, all of the medals up to 13, plus the national medal, in accordance with the public law. I believe that to be a contradiction, and I submit that there should be one national medal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Would your amendment specifically apply to a national medal?

Mr. McDONALD. No.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. What would it be?

Mr. McDONALD. The amendment, which will be submitted later today in my official statement, was an amendment by the bicentennial council delegates from each of the 13 States. We were in agreement with Mr. David Mahoney, chairman of the ARBC. We read to him the proposed amendment. He said he could live with it.

If I remember the language—and I will try to paraphrase it—it is that section 6 should be added to this bill, and that section 6 should say that any medals to be issued by the ARBC must first receive the prior approval of the State bicentennial councils. Now, we did not spell it out, and we cannot speak for the other States but we can speak for the 13.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. This is spelled out in your statement that you are submitting along with your reasons for asking that this amendment be included; is that it?

Mr. McDONALD. The reason for that is that we concurred with the national chairman, that is the reason.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The national chairman of the ARBC?

Mr. McDONALD. That is correct.

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Chairman, this question first arose back in May when a committee of our bicentennial council met in New York with Mr. Mahoney.

At that time, Mr. Mahoney and the executive director of the bicentennial commission gave us to understand that it was their intention to use the revenues—I believe you raised this question earlier—derived from these medals, that it was their intention to distribute that to the States so as to offset taking over markets for medals.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Revenue from the national medal?

Mr. GIBBS. That is what we were told in New York, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I could be wrong on this, but this is not my understanding. What I wanted to bring up too—and I did mention it—is that any profit on the State medals that you contract for is certainly not to go to the ARBC and then go back to you or a nonprofit group.

Mr. GIBBS. I wasn't referring to a State medal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. All right—about the national medal, that is produced by the mint, under this bill—I don't know how the revenue from that can go to a State.

Mr. GIBBS. I don't know either, but we posed the question that if they went into the market, it was going to decrease the market available to the States. The reply was that you will still get the money from it, because we intend to distribute these revenues to the States. Now, if this be possible, I should think it would be written into the bill, and I would think they would have no objections. Whether it is, as a matter of fact, possible for the Congress to write that in, I don't know. But our concern is really this, that the Congress do nothing to undercut our own efforts at self-help.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We will consider that, but I don't know how that could work on the national medal. As for the State medals, I understand that what the ARBC is trying to do is get together with your groups on sizes, et cetera.

Mr. McDONALD. We know what they are trying to do.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. And I am surprised—although that is the commission's job, not ours—to hear that they haven't met with the State groups, because certainly the States are most interested in this.

But I have taken too much time. I am going to pass this on.

Mr. McDONALD. I believe the testimony this morning earlier by Mrs. Brooks was that the projections on the sales of the Eisenhower medal would be 130 million.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is the number of coins Congress authorized for them to strike, using silver from the defense stockpile, and not counting the 20 million proof dollars also authorized.

Mr. McDONALD. That was my understanding of the testimony. There is no restriction as to the number that may be struck of the national medal or of the 14 other national medals. But if we were



to assume that each of those national medals would sell a minimum of 150 million, I submit to you that there would be no market left to the States for their particular medals or any series of medals that we might issue together. I again say that we are unfunded for the next fiscal year in the State of Rhode Island. We are depending on moneys we can raise through funding programs such as this.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I just tell you what the custom is on these commemorative medals, as shown by past experience. The nonprofit group which asks authorization for a national medal understands that it must pay all costs to the Treasury, and that they usually have a minimum that can be ordered at one time, such as 2,000 and then they can be reordered until a certain date. Never does the bill say how much they must order altogether, because it is up to the original group who are asking for this to determine how many they can sell. The order can always be repeated, up to a specified maximum. So I don't think that we would really put any limitation in here, as to how many must be produced.

Mr. McDONALD. May I propose, then, that perhaps the proper way to handle this would be, where the language of the bill says that a private contractor shall handle the distribution, perhaps the language should be changed to say that all of the medals should be distributed through the States or the State bicentennial commissions, and I think that probably that would solve a great deal of the problem.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I don't think we would have that authority unless the State commissions were willing to assume the responsibilities for the cost of striking. The conditions upon which we have agreed to authorize legislation to strike the medal is that some organization, some responsible organization assumes that responsibility of the cost, the necessary cost to the Treasury, to the mint. We can't bind the State, we can't compel a State—

Mr. McDONALD. I don't think that issue is valid. The ARBC is the proper organization. It spells out in the legislation that the ARBC will furnish those medals at cost, and that organization can then distribute them through a private contractor. I submit that the proper private contractor may well be the Bicentennial Commissions of the 50 States.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. You gentlemen should realize that the jurisdiction of this subcommittee and of the Banking and Currency Committee extends in this matter only to the use of the facilities of the mint for these medals, and not to what any other State commissions might decide to do or the Bicentennial Commission may decide to do about any medals not produced in the mint. If appropriate, however, the subcommittee, if it is so minded, could propose language in the committee report on H.R. 7987 dealing with some of the side issues. But it would only be advisory. I don't think we would want to try to tie the hands of the National Commission on its internal financing or the use of its funds. That commission contains eight Members of the Congress along with the public members, and the legislation which created it was not within the jurisdiction of this committee. So what we are discussing here is something which we in this subcommittee do not have any real control over if it involves State medals not struck at the mint. The Judiciary Committee, I believe,

has before it a bill, H.R. 7574, authorizing grants to the State bicentennial commissions. I will place that bill and a summary of it in the appendix so we will have that available. (The information referred to appears in the appendix at page 126.)

Mr. McDONALD. We are not addressing ourselves, Madam Chairman, to the State medal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Or on the national medal, the disposition of the funds coming back to the Commission from the sale of the national medals. This is the Commission's problem. We cannot in our legislation—

Mr. McDONALD. That is why we are asking for proper safeguards.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Wylie.

Mr. WYLIE. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

In your statement, Mr. McDonald, there may be some confusion in section 2. It says "in addition to the national medal." That seems to be rather specific, "in addition to the national medal," 13 medals. Then you refer to section 4, which says "the medals authorized under this act are national medals within the meaning of section 3851."

Did you read section 3851?

Mr. McDONALD. No, I have not.

Mr. WYLIE. There is no substitute for reading the law books, I have found, especially when they are read into the bill. The reason for that language is so that these medals can be struck by the mint under the regulations as prescribed by the superintendent and with the approval of the director of the mint. So it does not make them national medals, it does not raise them to the same medal as the one national level. It simply says that for this purpose, they shall be considered national medals, and the rules and regulations which pertain to the striking of the medal also applies to these 13 commemorative medals which commemorate specific historical events. So I do not think that there was any ambiguity or confusion in the section.

Mr. McDONALD. I believe that to be a matter of semantics, Mr. Wylie. You are authorizing up to 14 medals, and the legislation says there shall be one national medal.

Mr. WYLIE. It says in addition to the national medal. I don't see how you could be more specific than that.

Mr. McDONALD. As I say, I believe it to be a question of semantics.

Mr. WYLIE. But then it says, under the provisions of this act, they shall be considered a national medal. I don't think it is necessary for me to read it, but I will incorporate section 368 of title 31 of the United States Code in the record at this point.

(The section of the United States Code referred to by Mr. Wylie follows:)

§ 368. National and other medals struck at Philadelphia Mint

Dies of a national character may be executed by the engraver, and national and other medals struck by the superintendent of coining department of the mint at Philadelphia, under such regulations as the superintendent, with the approval of the Director of the Mint, may prescribe. Such work shall not, however, interfere with the regular coinage operations, and no private medal dies shall be prepared at any mint, or the machinery or apparatus therefore be used for that purpose. R.S. § 3551; Aug. 23, 1912, c. 350, § 1, 37 Stat. 394; Jan. 3, 1923, c. 22, 42 Stat. 1103.

Mr. WYLIE. How did the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission come into existence, Mr. McDonald?



Mr. McDONALD. The Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission came into existence because of a bill which I introduced into the Rhode Island House which created an 18 member commission. It was passed in the 1969 session. We were not funded in that particular year. We were funded in the following fiscal year in the amount of \$25,000. But because of the budgetary problems, we are facing in Rhode Island, this year, June 30 is the end of the fiscal year, and we still have not devised a revenue program for the next year. So the Governor cut us out of the budget, and we are unfunded for the next year.

Mr. WYLIE. Did all of the States pass similar legislation?

Mr. McDONALD. Each State, by and large, has developed its own bicentennial commission. In most instances, it has been done by statute. In some instances it has been done by executive appointment. It is my understanding that there are eight States which have not yet appointed a bicentennial commission.

Mr. WYLIE. How did the bicentennial council of the original 13 States come into existence?

Mr. McDONALD. The Bicentennial Council of the Original Thirteen States came into existence in Newport, R.I., on June 3 and 4, last year. Members of the delegation for the Thirteen Original States came to Rhode Island at my invitation. We met again this year in March at Raleigh, and we met just this past weekend at Williamsburg. We have another meeting planned in October in Savannah, Ga. We hope that we can develop a series of programs that will run concurrently in the Thirteen Original States, since we feel that we in the original colonies have something unique to offer to the bicentennial. We were forced to action because of inaction. We hope that we can develop a meaningful program which hopefully will attract the attention of the rest of the country and the world.

Mr. WYLIE. Did you request a meeting with the national commission? The national commission has received widespread publicity, and Congress has appropriated a considerable amount of money.

Mr. McDONALD. Most of our States have representatives on the ARBC. As a matter of fact, the senior Senator from Rhode Island is a member, Senator Pastore. I have conferred with him privately.

Mr. WYLIE. Then you think there is some liaison between your commission and the National Bicentennial Commission?

Mr. McDONALD. The problem is not, I think, with the members of the ARBC. It is the problem of getting the attention of the staff. If you will read Mr. Gibbs' statement, I think that that relates to the difficulties we have with the ARBC staff; that has been admitted by the national chairman, he has admitted it at our private meeting in May in his office in New York, and he admitted the difficulty this past week in Williamsburg. He has said that by and large the difficulty has been with understaffing and with underfunding.

Mr. WYLIE. Did you want to comment on that, Mr. Gibbs?

Mr. GIBBS. Yes, I would, sir.

As to your point as to whether we attempted to have a meeting with the National Bicentennial Commission, I began efforts in this direction a year ago this past March, and repeatedly asked them to meet with the 13 States. First, it was to gain an input into the report due the President last July. Subsequent to that it was to have the States get together to consider that report and give their reaction to it. I was

never able to establish a working relationship with them to have a meeting in conjunction with the 13 States. I was informed, as a matter of fact, in late November or early December, the date escapes me at the moment, that they could not as a matter of fact, have regional meetings until they had first employed a State coordinator. I subsequently discovered at the time that was written that they were already planning a meeting in San Francisco, as a matter of fact.

Mr. WYLIE. I think that someone has to get it up. I think that is a matter of coordination between you. I don't think the Members of Congress or this committee can do that. I think that is something you are going to have to do.

I assume all 50 States have provided for a bicentennial commission. That comes back to the observation I wanted to make, if all 50 States have to approve the national bicentennial medal, I doubt if we ever get one. So, I think someone has to make the decision.

Mr. GIBBS. Not the approval, but some suggestions, certainly.

Mr. WYLIE. Is there anything wrong with writing a letter?

Mr. GIBBS. If we were aware that the thing is being planned at all.

Mr. WYLIE. I might add, Mr. Gibbs, that I find your ideas very refreshing, and we are certainly glad to have both of you gentlemen here this morning. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. GIBBS. Thank you very kindly.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. González has a comment to make.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I want to say that I don't agree with your contention that section 2 is contradictory or inimical to the State's interest. I want to say that if we are to have any amendments, I would suggest one or two. First, increasing that figure of 13, because we have States such as mine that are intensely interested in the bicentennial, and which historically predate some of those so-called original colonies as far as history is concerned. So I think if there is to be an amendment, it should be that.

Mr. WYLIE. Ohio was the first State in the Northwest Territory.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. St Germain.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. You are not going to try to compete with Roger Williams, are you?

Mr. GONZALEZ. They were domesticating the Indians and building aqueducts in San Antonio when Roger Williams—

Mr. ST GERMAIN. But these people came up from Mexico.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Any questions, Mr. St Germain.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. No.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Williams.

Mr. GIBBS. May I interrupt, Madam Chairman, before we leave. Mr. Gonzalez' point, the number 13, as we understand it, has nothing whatever to do with the 13 States. I don't know where the number came from. I think it actually came from the idea that they wanted to start issuing medals in 1971 and going through 1983. And that is where the number 13 came from. It has nothing to do with the Thirteen Original States.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. When I first heard about the 13 commemorative medals, Mr. Gibbs, that was my first thought, that these were representative of the original 13 States. But they explained to me, in presenting the draft of this bill for introduction, that they are not going to issue State medals as such—that that is going to be up to the States



and would not be covered in the legislation. I asked about these 13 additional commemorative medals and was told these are to commemorate specific historical events, and have nothing to do with any particular State.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. GIBBS. May I add this? You might be interested in knowing that the bicentennial council has adopted as an official resolution of policy that it is true that no particular area or bloodline of the United States or its people has any unique and hard claim on the heritage of the United States, that we feel that we are all equally beneficiaries of the Revolutionary generation, or all equally their spiritual heirs.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Chairman, I just wanted to make one comment with respect to Mr. St Germain's remarks about Mexico.

That is that when Columbus sailed the ocean blue, half of my ancestors were on the ship with him and the other half were on the shore ready to greet him when he arrived.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. McDonald, you heard my last question of Mr. Lang. I was referring to the philatelic-numismatic commemorative combination issued by the ARBC. I refer to his statement on page 6. "The Commission intends to use a private sector on a competitive basis to handle all facets, order-taking, packaging, shipping, other than the striking of the commemorative medals." Mr. Lang indicated to me that they were going to use the private sector by advertising for bids, and the contract would go to the lowest qualified bidder, and the profit would go to the ARBC. Also, Mr. Lang indicated that in some way, this money was going to go also to the States. Have any firm agreements been reached with the States by the ARBC saying that some of these profits go to the States?

Mr. McDONALD. No firm agreement, Congressman. We did meet with Mr. Mahoney, the national chairman in his New York office on May 4 or 5. I think at that time he said that it was his hope that the issuance would be limited to six medallions, six commemorative medals, and that the profits from all of those would inure to the States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In your testimony, you indicate that in your opinion it should be one official commemorative medal for the bicentennial made by the U.S. Mint?

Mr. McDONALD. I did, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That any other commemorative medal should be issued by the States, including Texas and Rhode Island and that the profit in the issuance of those commemorative medals for the bicentennial should go directly to those States to help them in their bicentennial efforts.

Mr. McDONALD. May I speak to that point, sir?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. McDONALD. I have been involved quite intimately with the bicentennial now in the Rhode Island program for the past 3 years. We have a program in Rhode Island which is not the confetti type of program. We hope to restore the building in which the original Declaration of Independence from the Crown was declared. That building is presently used today as a courthouse and it has fallen into a great deal of disrepair. There are several other buildings which we

hope to restore for future generations. There are various historical monographs we want to do, various types of study in scholarship that we want to enter into, so that there will be something lasting as a result of Rhode Island's contribution to the bicentennial. My estimate of these programs is that they may appropriate in the area of \$5 million. There is no way that I can get those funds from my State legislature, nor can private sources in my State contribute that much.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But you do believe that you can raise that money through your own efforts by the sale of commemorative medals, or perhaps even coins, right at the State level?

Mr. McDONALD. Partly, sir; I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I read in the newspaper about your meeting at Williamsburg this past weekend. And you state that this is the first contact with the ARBC.

Mr. McDONALD. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was a little confused by the news release I saw. Were you hosting the members of the ARBC, or was it the other way around?

Mr. McDONALD. I will let Mr. Gibbs address that question.

Mr. GIBBS. It was a scheduled meeting of the bicentennial council. And Mr. Mahoney, chairman of the National Bicentennial Commission was there at our invitation issued to him in New York in May. And, subsequently, he requested invitations for several members of the staff to accompany him which, of course, we granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was actually a meeting of the bicentennial council?

Mr. GIBBS. Indeed there was.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Thirteen Original States?

Mr. GIBBS. The news release for some unexplained reason simply indicated that it was one of a continuing series of meetings scheduled by the ARBC itself. This is incorrect.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Gibbs, as I understand your position, you take the position that the ARBC is preempting the field of commemorative medals for the bicentennial to the exclusion of the State bicentennial commissions. In other words, if they put out these 14 medals that we are talking about, they are going to preempt the entire field and close it off to the individual 50 States of the Union.

Mr. GIBBS. I would submit to you, sir, that when you speak of millions of a series of 14, I am no great economist, but it seems to me that there is only so much that any market can absorb of any given product. I am suggesting that if this happens, and these revenues are not going to be available to the States, that the States are going hollering to Congress saying, now, we have got to have Federal help. As of now, North Carolina does not plan to ask Congress for any money. But if you are going to take away my self-help, then we would be something like a federally impacted area for which we would be due compensation as a matter of fact.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. McDonald has given his estimates as to how many of these commemorative medals can be sold, and it runs into hundreds of millions, a series of 14. I seriously question the ability of the U.S. Mint to turn out commemorative medals in these quantities. I do know that when the Philadelphia Mint was being built, it was being built to accommodate a new coin-producing machine called the coin roller,



which was being developed by a private corporation. The building was built to accommodate this particular type of equipment, which, incidentally, never worked, and they gave up on it entirely. So the production of the U.S. Mint is not anywhere near what it was estimated to be. So do you agree that the U.S. Mint would have difficulty in turning out the quantities of commemorative medals that you have mentioned?

Mr. GIBBS. I don't believe that I would be qualified to give an opinion on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. McDonald?

Mr. McDONALD. I will not address myself to that proposition.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. No questions.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. McKinney?

Mr. McKINNEY. Just a few questions.

Would you agree, gentlemen, that all of the State coins are going to at least follow a formula, a formula as to size and metal content?

Mr. McDONALD. I don't necessarily agree with that.

Mr. McKINNEY. I would suggest, just as a private individual that the entire continuity of the program would be totally destroyed if this didn't happen. Nobody is going to want to collect the national sets if they are of different sizes, shapes, and descriptions. It surprises me somewhat—I am from Connecticut, and we have the same problem, but I am sure you are well aware that our revenue problem far exceeds yours. As an ex-minority leader of the House, I can tell you that we are never going to appropriate any money for this either. But what surprises me is that you don't feel that you can raise \$5 million between private contributions and the sale of the State medallion, which you would not only sell to members of your own State but which you would sell across the country. Probably every library system in the United States and every collector in the United States would buy it as a part of the total set. In other words, if you were to go to one of the private mint companies, and you would put out the Rhode Island medallion, as we will probably put out the Connecticut medallion, it would seem to me that it would not be expecting too much to be able to raise \$5 or \$6 million between the sale of that particular medallion and private contributions.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. McKinney, this past weekend when we were in Williamsburg, a gentleman appeared before us to discuss medallic programs. I believe he is here today and will testify before you later. And it is my understanding of his testimony that the commemorative medalion for the State of Illinois, which is much bigger than the State of Rhode Island, netted a profit of half a million dollars. Now, we in the State of Rhode Island have less than a million people. All of the public solicitations for funds in Rhode Island in the last year have fallen short of their goal. As you may know—I am sure you know, being from Connecticut—the State of Rhode Island is very predominantly Roman Catholic. The Bishops' Fund this year fell short of its goal for the first time in the history of the Diocese of Rhode Island. The United Fund solicitation for funds fell short of its goal. The Rhode Island Historical Society presently is engaged in the process of raising funds to do some of its work, and it is running short of its goal. Things are getting worse instead of better in the area of solicitation. It is very diffi-

cult, as you know, to raise funds. I know that you must raise funds in your campaign just as everyone else does, and I am sure you are feeling the pinch there just as we are every place else.

Mr. McKINNEY. I pride myself on having one of the largest debts in the present Congress. Maybe that comes from political independence.

What I am trying to get at, though, and I agree that you have a problem but I think you are missing one point: I know Rhode Island has a problem. I am on the board of three hospitals and I know the money situation. I just received within the last few months a private gift from one of the States, I am embarrassed to say I don't remember which, I think South Carolina, a commemorative medal in a beautiful blue box covered with blue felt. I was delighted to have it, and I hope that maybe I can collect more if I stay around long enough. I am sure that they cost money. I am sure that a State medal, per se, doesn't kick up the interest that an entire national celebration of an anniversary does. I think that you underestimate the amount of medals you will sell, because they will be selling as national sets. I know right now that just as an individual that I would bend every effort to make sure that I had all 50 State medals in some kind of appropriate frame. There is another point that I would like you, as a State, to consider. You say you don't want help from the Federal Government but we, at the same time, are pouring millions and millions of dollars into this celebration. Quite frankly, I am getting a little piqued at the amount of money we are spending on it. I think that we had better find some fashion somewhere along the line—and this is one of the things I intend to suggest as we go along—some point where the national committee starts to pay some of its way.

So I don't really see the difference between making some effort to sell a national coin and making some money in that field, and not giving that money to the States, and Congress turning around and appropriating money. In other words, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

Mr. McDONALD. So that you will know, Mr. McKinney, there is proposed legislation that would appropriate, I think, up to \$40,000 this year and next year to each of the 50 States to begin the planning of the bicentennial. Now, perhaps this would be defrayed to a certain extent by the sale of medals. Now, again, I have no objection to the national medal. I think we should have a national medal. I think the U.S. Mint should strike the national medal. I think the U.S. Mint should strike a coin of the realm using the great seal of this country on the up-side, and on the reverse using the State seals of each of the individual 50 States. But I think that if we are going to carry on an effective grassroots commemorative, if we are going to celebrate the bicentennial from the States and not from Washington, then the States must have the funds to carry out those programs. And I submit to you, without trying to get crassly commercial, without importing tomahawks from Hong Kong, that we must have revenue. And this is one of the viable means for us to raise revenue.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. May I say, that we have 5 years before this event is going to happen. Of course, we have to plan it. But there are many things that you as State commissioners are going to have to settle with the chairman and the other members of the National Commission—not just with the gentleman who has been in charge of the medals—but on the other questions too, of financial support for the State celebration.



We have two more sets of witnesses that we have to hear before the bells ring, calling us over to the House. So I thank both of you gentlemen for coming. You have given us some questions that we want to put to the Commission ourselves, that I think have not been answered, but I do not think they necessarily have to do with this bill. Thank you very much.

Mr. McDONALD. I thank you for your kindness and consideration.

Mr. GIBBS. Thank you very much.

(The following letter and documents were submitted for inclusion in the record at this point:)

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

*Washington, D.C. July 15, 1971.*

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reference to the hearings on H.R. 7987 to authorize medals commemorating the Bicentennial of the American Revolution before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency on June 29, 1971.

In view of the testimony of Mr. Richard F. Gibbs, Executive Secretary of the North Carolina American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and Chairman of the Bicentennial Council of the Thirteen Original States, and that of State Representative George F. McDonald, Chairman of the Rhode Island State Bicentennial Commission, regarding the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, I respectfully request that the enclosed material be included at an appropriate place in the record.

Sincerely,

M. L. SPECTOR, *Executive Director.*

RE GIBBS & McDONALD TESTIMONY

ARBC CONTRACTS WITH NORTH CAROLINA AND RHODE ISLAND BICENTENNIAL COMMISSIONS

ARBC records do not support the statements by Messrs. Gibbs and McDonald that there has been little or no contact between the ARBC and the Bicentennial Commissions of North Carolina and Rhode Island.

On the contrary, such records indicate that the first contact between ARBC and the Bicentennial Commission of North Carolina was initiated by ARBC on September 3, 1969, immediately after ARBC completed its first task, the submission to the President of a National Plan for the commemoration. Since that time there have been approximately 45 written communications between ARBC and its Commission members and the North Carolina Commission and Mr. Gibbs.

In addition, there have been approximately 50 telephone conversations and a number of face-to-face meetings between representatives of ARBC and Mr. Gibbs.

Contacts between ARBC and the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission include the following:

A Rhode Island representative attended an ARBC meeting for the 50 States in Washington in October, 1969.

In July, 1970, Mr. McDonald requested and received several ARBC documents.

In December, 1970, Mr. McDonald spent two days at ARBC headquarters in Washington meeting with staff and being briefed on details. Following such meetings, Mr. McDonald wrote to the ARBC Executive Director, "Would you kindly thank all of your people who were of assistance to me while I was in town. It certainly was a worthwhile experience for me."

In February, 1971, the Rhode Island representative attended a two day ARBC Commission meeting, held in San Francisco.

In May, 1971, a Rhode Island representative attended a two day ARBC Commission meeting and workshop held in Dallas, Texas.

The above chronology of contacts between ARBC, and North Carolina and Rhode Island is not exhaustive. It is illustrative of the early and continuing contacts since 1969.

Notwithstanding the above, ARBC willingly admits that it should be doing more with the various State Commissions and in January, 1971, appointed a State Coordinator exclusively as liaison with the several States. Also, ARBC is anxiously awaiting funding for FY '72 to further its ability to work with the States and is in the process of establishing regional offices to coordinate local planning. We expect such actions to result in close cooperation between States and localities and the ARBC, and in a truly grass roots commemoration.

It is worth noting that according to the attached press release, issued by the Bicentennial Council of the 13 Original States, Mr. Gibbs and Mr. McDonald are negotiating with the Franklin Mint on behalf of the Council.

#### PNC REVENUES TO THE STATES

At the present time ARBC basic statutory authority (P.L. 89-491) permits ARBC to "expend in furtherance of this Act funds . . . received in pursuance of contracts hereunder . . ."

Under this authority, ARBC may receive revenues from the sale of commemorative medals and expend them for authorized purposes. However, ARBC has no authority at present to grant any such funds to State Commissions or to other beneficiaries.

ARBC amendments now before the Congress (H.R. 7374) would authorize grants to the States for the establishment and implementation of State Bicentennial Commissions.

While ARBC expects to assist in various ways the States, local communities, and appropriate patriotic and service organizations in their Bicentennial planning and development, direct financial assistance will be dependent upon legal and policy considerations not yet determined. Thus, no commitment has been made by Chairman Mahoney or the ARBC to distribute total PNC revenues to the States.

ARBC does not believe it would be appropriate at this time to pledge all such revenues for future specific uses. Such decisions would appear to be proper for determination by the Commission in its overall development of Commission policy. Such policy will of course implement whatever changes may be made in the ARBC basic legislative charter by H.R. 7374 or subsequent amendments.

---

[Immediate release]

#### BICENTENNIAL COUNCIL OF THE 13 ORIGINAL STATES, WILLIAMSBURG LODGE, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., JUNE 27, 1971

Representatives of the Bicentennial Commissions of the 13 Original States today (Sunday) formally constituted themselves as the Bicentennial Council of the 13 Original States to work together on joint projects and activities to celebrate the country's 200th anniversary.

Some of the highlights of the By-Laws of the Council are:

To explore and develop ways in which the Bicentennial agencies of the original 13 states may share with each other and with all of the 50 states of the union ideas, methods, programs, and activities directed toward the goal of broadening the public's understanding of the importance of and the need for participation in the forthcoming commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

To cooperate with the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission in activities involving the original 13 states and to assist in the liaison relationships between the Commission and the individual state Bicentennial agencies.

To provide an opportunity to the Bicentennial agencies of the original 13 states to consult with each other as to the means by which they may seek financial support and assistance from private, public, business, federal, and foundation funds and other monies to support the activities and purposes of the respective state agencies.

The two-day meeting of the Council at the Williamsburg Lodge was hosted by the Virginia Independence Bicentennial Commission, chaired by the Honorable Lewis A. McMurran, Jr.

Mr. David J. Mahoney, chairman of the Federal American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission, met with the Council. Governor and Mrs. A. Linwood Holton were honored guests at a reception on Saturday night.



The Bicentennial Council suggested that the ARBC could be most helpful by: Improving communications with the Bicentennial Council and the states and providing full information about legislation and other federal programs that involve the states.

Indicating the federal programs that might be used to provide financial support for the activities of the states.

Defining the period of the Commemorative observance.

Mr. Richard F. Gibbs, executive director of the North Carolina American Revolution Bicentennial Council, was elected chairman of the Bicentennial Council, and Mr. McMurran was named vice chairman. Others elected were Mr. Bruce K. Price, executive director of the Maryland Bicentennial Commission, as treasurer, and George H. Ebner, executive director of the Bicentennial Commission of Pennsylvania as secretary.

A resolution of thanks was adopted praising Representative George F. McDonauld, chairman of the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission, who has been serving as chairman.

The Bicentennial Council voted to enter into negotiations with the Franklin Mint, the World's largest private mint, located in Franklin, Penn., to sponsor the first medallion program for the Bicentennial Council which will feature the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

The by-laws of the Council and the medallion program will be submitted to the 13 state bicentennial agencies for ratification.

A proposed fund-raising program for the Council was outlined by James J. Marshall of Public Affairs Consultants of America, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

A committee on Historic Revolutionary Sites was appointed headed by Dr. Jordan D. Fiore of Massachusetts to draw up a master calendar of sites and commemorative events for the 13 states.

A committee on goals was also established.

Mr. Ebner was asked to report on the status of the Philadelphia Exposition at the next meeting.

It was agreed to hold the next meeting in Savannah, Georgia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Could I suggest that if the bells do ring, that we perhaps break and hear the witnesses at one or two?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. They are here, and I don't like to put them off. I would say that if the bells ring, three bells for a quorum, that we could just recess for maybe 15 or 20 minutes and come right back. Would that be satisfactory, before we get into any legislation this afternoon?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought we might recess for an hour.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I don't want to put the remaining witnesses at a disadvantage, because we have had them here all day. I think we can get through very quickly.

Let's try, and see what happens.

We are pleased to call now two of the outstanding executives in the numismatic publishing field, Mrs. Margo Russell, from Sidney, Ohio, editor of *Coin World*, and Mr. Chester L. Krause, of Iola, Wis., publisher of *Numismatic News*.

Now, Mrs. Russell served as a cochairman, I believe, of the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission which recommended the policies now translated into H.R. 7987.

The editor of Mr. Krause's publication, Mr. Clifford Mishler also served on that panel.

Mr. Russell, you may start. You have submitted a fine statement, which we appreciated receiving in advance. Then we will hear from Mr. Krause before going to the questioning. So, if you will do what we also asked the other witnesses to do—be brief in your summary—then we can question.

**STATEMENT OF MARGO RUSSELL, EDITOR, COIN WORLD NEWS-PAPER, AND VICE CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION'S ADVISORY PANEL ON COINS AND MEDALS**

Mrs. RUSSELL. Thank you, Madam Chairman. It is a privilege to be before this committee. I have been following your coin- and medal-related activities since 1963. I think you are very fairminded and wise.

We feel that no single form of observance of the American Revolution Bicentennial will touch more lives or communicate the very reason for the bicentennial observance than the numismatic issues.

So, we believe that every man, woman, and child in the United States must have an opportunity to buy or obtain these pieces, whether they be coins, medals, or paper money.

Now, we have been discussing this morning limited issues of bicentennial pieces, and I will have you know that there has already been a grand and glorious free-for-all. There are lots and lots of pieces already produced and available to the collector. I have attached a log, a Coin World log of bicentennial pieces already in existence. There are more reported every week, believe me. In fact, there is the philatelic-numismatic cover that Congressman Williams discussed in this log. So there is a precedent for this piece. In fact, they are producing philatelic-numismatic covers in New Zealand, Congressman Williams. But we are getting a little out of our territory.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would have to plead innocent to anything that is going on in New Zealand.

Mrs. RUSSELL. No one has mentioned how important H.R. 7987 is as far as esthetics are concerned. We are already behind in the United States as far as the art of the medal compared to our European counterparts. We have an opportunity in this bill to really soar as we approach the renaissance of the art of the medal.

Now thanks to the cataloging, publicity, and new merchandising methods of the Bureau of the Mint, there has been a new focus on the national or list or mint medal. These are all terms used in our hobby to describe pieces struck at the mint. They are enjoying new popularity and bicentennial medal issues are expected to be complementary to the survival of interest in earlier mint medals. Folks will go back and buy the earlier issues.

The mint-struck pieces that relate to the bicentennial are included in the log which we have attached for the record.

The outstanding artistic production and enterprise of private medal-producing firms in the United States has brought about a whole new focus on public attention upon the medal and its powers as the vehicle to portray and educate in the fields of art and history. President Nixon and former Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, and Eisenhower have been devotees of the art of the medal.

As the coins and the medal advisory panel for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission set about its work, it determined that the national medal or medals to commemorate the Nation's 200th birthday must be the finest possible example of medallion art, and worthy of the occasion. We also had great concern that there be a fair and wide distribution of such medals. At the time we started our work, not very many State organizations had been formed.



In the numismatic fraternity there is an undeniable prestige associated with medallions struck at the U.S. Mint. And there is also a growing sentiment for mint medals from the general public who associate a kind of legality with mint-struck pieces.

It is our hope that the mint's quality control has improved by the time these medallions would be struck, and that the mint could revert to its former care and craftsmanship which made the mint medals of yesteryears true works of art.

I am aware that the medal production facility has been neglected in the transition period when the mint in Philadelphia moved from its third to its fourth home in 1969. Prior to that time, the mint found its prime concern, and rightfully so, in the production of coinage to prevent a coin shortage. So the medal production refinements were forced to take a back seat.

All of us in the science of numismatics hope that the mint will return to sharply struck, well-finished pieces such as it produced in an earlier era. It is my conviction and of most of my counterparts, that the mint should make a concerted effort to produce the American Revolution Bicentennial Medal in the finest manner possible by means of today's sophisticated technology. We believe the mint can do this.

Last year, Coin World polled 100 numismatic leaders and representative collectors to determine their opinion concerning the medallic observance of America's bicentennial. We also discussed coins. But since this bill does not relate to coins, I certainly won't refer to coins. So we are here with kind of a mandate based on their response.

Collectors and numismatic leaders want an official national medal struck at a United States mint facility. They spoke most frequently of a 3-inch-in-diameter medal available in both silver (preestablished, preannounced limited issue), and bronze (unlimited number), with gold presentation pieces for the Presidents under which the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission serves, and for the national numismatic collections at the Smithsonian and the mint. Collectors would like a smaller version of the official medal, probably slightly over \$1 size, again in silver and bronze, with limited gold specimens. They want an award version of two sizes, with space for appropriate engraving, or beribboned or set apart in some manner as an award piece.

They want sets of four medallions, two large and two small medals in bronze and silver with appropriate and decorative encasement. Now, this has precedent because there was a similar set offered when we celebrated our centennial birthday.

We tried to pinpoint the suggested cost and number of national medals. This was difficult to project by the numismatic public because of fluctuating silver prices, although some recommended advance ordering procedures to help determine demand. They were outspoken on the suggested price for the bronze pieces, however. They felt that they should sell for approximately \$5, and almost everyone wanted to see the smaller medallions selling for \$1 or \$1.25. They wanted these low-cost items for the youngsters.

They indicated that competition for the official Bicentennial Commission medallion should be open to all U.S. artists who can submit a plaster model. This opens the field to a wide range of artists, and yet limits it to sculptors who can furnish a model. This eliminates the semi-skilled or the unskilled at the outset.

Others, however, want a completely free and open competition for design as a token of democracy. In other words, the newsboy could offer a design for this medallion. Many recommended a cash prize to the winner of the design competition, although most agreed that such a distinction would be payment and prestige enough for most.

Now, some State commissions which have launched their medallion program showing us that there is additional and dramatic focus as a lead-in to the bicentennial year. We like the thought of using private minting sources for the State medals, because this, again, develops a grassroot interest, it recognizes free enterprise, and makes use of the exceptional fine facilities available in the private minting world.

We have a feeling that private minting facilities might already be busy. Witness the list of issues that I have attached. Some firms are already distributing American Revolution Bicentennial theme medals on a public subscription basis.

Most private firms are so accomplished and highly skilled, as a matter of fact, that there is some comfort in the fact that if for some unforeseen reason the mint could not strike the national medallion, that there would be a private substitute waiting in the wings.

We would call your attention to the fact that there is a wide range of aesthetic appeal of the privately struck medallic offerings—everything from platinum and gold to aluminum. This will be a colorful and interesting array.

Collectors will buy one specimen of each of the 50 States, we are certain. Thus each State Commission would have a source of individual revenue from the sale of medallions.

As a point of information to this committee, I would like to mention, especially to Congressman Williams, that the ARBC staff many months ago called me as editor of *Coin World*, and asked me to supply tearsheets and some editorial background on a philatelic-numismatic cover. So, I believe the staff, if not the full Commission, had this under study for quite awhile.

We have included with our statement, recent *Coin World* editorials related to the bicentennial and numismatic issues, "Distant Drums Come Nearer," and "Hobby Gets a Voice," which appear in the current edition of *Coin World*. With your permission, I will include those in the record.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That may be done.

Mrs. RUSSELL. We appreciate the opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee and present our views. We thank you most kindly.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Russell, with attachments follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARGO RUSSELL, EDITOR, COIN WORLD NEWSPAPER, AND VICE CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION'S ADVISORY PANEL ON COINS AND MEDALS

My name is Margo Russell. I am editor of *Coin World*, a numismatic newspaper with a paid weekly circulation of 128,000, published in Sidney, Ohio. I am also vice chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission's advisory panel on coins and medals.

It is a privilege to appear before this wise and fair-minded committee, an opinion based upon my close following of your coin and medal related activities as I have regularly reported upon them over the years.



No single form of observance of the American Revolution Bicentennial will touch more lives, or communicate the very reason for the Bicentennial observance than the numismatic issues.

Every effort must be made to see that each man, woman and child in the United States has an opportunity to acquire whatever pieces are produced, whether they be coins, medals or paper money.

Equality of distribution and a range of fair prices will be all-important factors in accomplishing what I believe must be a prime goal—reaching Everyman!

I can assure you there is much numismatic excitement already being generated for what promises to be a grand and glorious occasion. We are attaching for the record a Coin World log of Bicentennial-related medals already in existence with more being reported each week.

Production of such pieces, we guarantee, will accelerate as we draw closer to the year, 1976, calendar-wise and in spirit.

American Revolution Bicentennial medals promise to be numismatically significant beyond measure since the United States appears to be entering the renaissance of the art of the medal, an art form highly developed and revered abroad.

Our Department of the Treasury has been producing medals to capture the nation's history in frozen metal for nearly 200 years. Thanks to the recent cataloguing, publicity and merchandising processes instituted by the Bureau of the Mint, the "national", "list" or "Mint" medals, all terms used in the hobby to describe pieces struck at the Mint, are enjoying new popularity. Bicentennial medal issues are expected to be complementary to this revival of interest in earlier Mint medals.

The outstanding artistic production and enterprise of private medal-producing firms in the United States has brought about a whole new focus on public attention upon the medal and its powers as a vehicle to portray and educate in the fields of art and history. President Nixon, former Presidents Johnson and Kennedy have been devotees of the art of the medal.

As the coins and medals advisory panel for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission set about its work, it determined the national medal or medals to commemorate the nation's 200th birthday must be the finest possible example of medallion art, worthy of the occasion. It also emphasized there must be a fair, widespread distribution of such a medal or medals.

In the numismatic fraternity there is an undeniable prestige associated with medallions struck at the United States Mint. There is also growing sentiment for Mint medals from the general public who associate a kind of "legality" with Mint-struck pieces.

Since the legislation you are considering calls for national medallions, it appears they will be produced by the United States Mint.

It is my hope, however, that the Mint quality control has improved by the time these medallions would be struck, and that the Mint could revert to its former care and craftsmanship which made the Mint medals of yesteryear true works of art.

I am aware that the medal production facility has been neglected in the transition period when the Mint in Philadelphia moved from its third to its fourth home in 1969. Prior to that time, the Mint found its prime concern, and rightfully so, was in the production of coinage to prevent a coin shortage, and again the medallion production refinements were forced to take a back seat.

All of us hope the Mint will soon return to sharply struck, well finished pieces it produced in an earlier era. It is my conviction, and of most of my counterparts, that the Mint should make a concerted effort to produce the American Revolution Bicentennial medal in the finest manner possible by means of today's sophisticated technology.

The best medal ever seen by the American public should emerge as a representation of the American Revolution Bicentennial commemoration. This is a big order, but I believe the Mint can do it!

Late last year Coin World polled 100 numismatic leaders and representative collectors to determine their opinion concerning the medallion observance of America's Bicentennial. So we come before you with a kind of mandate, based on their response.

The consensus based on this survey was that there should be the following medallion issues:

An "official" or "national" medal struck at a U.S. Mint facility, to be at least three inches in diameter, available in both silver (pre-established, pre-announced limited issue) and bronze, (unlimited number) with gold presentation pieces for the Presidents under which the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission serves, and for the national numismatic collections.

Smaller versions of the official medal, probably slightly over one-dollar size, again in silver and bronze with the limited gold specimens.

An award version of the two sizes, with space for appropriate engraving, or beribboned, or set apart in some manner as an award piece.

Sets of four medallions—two large and two small medals in bronze and silver with appropriate and decorative encasement. This has precedent, I believe, with a similar set being issued in 1876 during the nation's centennial observance.

Suggested costs and number of silver national medals seemed difficult to project by the numismatic public due to fluctuating silver prices, although some recommended advance ordering procedures to help determine demand. The three-inch bronze should sell for approximately \$5.00, the survey indicated. The smaller bronze medals should sell for \$1.00 or \$1.25, poll respondents indicated as they emphasized there must be a low cost item.

Competition for the official Bicentennial Commission medallion should be open to all United States artists who can submit a plaster model, many numismatists indicated in the Coin World poll because this opens the field to a wide range of artists, yet limits it to sculptors who can furnish a model, thus eliminating the unskilled or semi-skilled at the outset.

Others, however, want a completely free and open competition for design as a token of democracy. Many recommended a cash prize to the winner of the design competition, although most agreed such a distinction would be payment and prestige enough for most.

Just as we urge the best possible production of the Bicentennial medals, we earnestly petition for the most artistic, aesthetic designs, approved only after they have been subjected to inspection by a succession of the best medallic art experts.

We are watching with intense interest the Mint's current ordering and distribution procedures for the Eisenhower dollar coins. Perhaps such machinery could be used to offer and to distribute National Bicentennial medallions.

Some state commissions have already launched their medal programs, giving additional and dramatic focus as a lead-in to the Bicentennial year.

Use of private minting sources for the state medals would develop grassroots interest, recognize free enterprise, and make use of the exceptionally fine facilities available.

That the private minting facilities will be busy, we have no doubt—witness the issues listed in the Coin World Bicentennial log. Some firms are already distributing American Revolution Bicentennial-theme medal series on a subscription basis.

Most private firms are so accomplished and highly skilled, as a matter of fact, there is some comfort in the fact that if for some unforeseen reason the Mint could not serve in the production and distribution of the national medallions, a private substitute is waiting in the wings. There is precedent for this procedure—Medallic Art Company in New York has come to the aid of the Mint in past years during occasional work overloads at the Mint.

Should other private minting firms have equipment to produce high relief art medals under secure circumstances, it is my feeling these firms should have the opportunity to bid for the privilege of striking the official or national Bicentennial medals, should the Mint find it impossible to produce them.

We would call your attention to the wide range of aesthetic appeal of the privately-struck medallic offerings—everything from platinum and gold to aluminum. To say the least, the majority of privately produced Bicentennial numismatic items will be a colorful and interesting array!

Collectors will vie for one specimen of each of the 50 states, we are certain, and thus each state Commission would have a source of individual revenue from the sale of medallions.

It should be considered that each state could approach the Mint for "National" medal production by having a congressman introduce legislation to provide for the striking of such medallions. Mint-struck medals have realized highly successful sales. Here again the Mint's production facilities could be overtaxed.

As this committee well knows, last year nine medals were authorized by Congress, and struck at the Mint. These included medals in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library at Westminster College.



Fulton, Mo.; commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Fisheries Society; the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of South Carolina; one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Wichita, Kansas; 150th anniversary of the founding of the state of Alabama, the 50th anniversary of the United States Diplomatic Courier Service and medals for Jose Antonio Navarro. Ohio Northern University and Stone Mountain Memorial.

The Bureau of the Mint combined numismatics and philatelies in a commemorative postmarked keepsake distributed at the dedication of the new Philadelphia Mint in 1969.

A half dollar-size bronze medallion struck by the Mint, a colorful cover and a postmark on the opening day was offered to the collectors at the Mint. Collectors stood in line for hours to purchase, one to a person, for \$1.50 the 10,000 postmarked covers. They were sold out within two weeks, an all-time record for any government medal.

The ARBC Coins and Medals advisory panel has advocated such a packet, colorful with appropriate designs, as a supplement to its program of inexpensive items to be made available to the public as a 200th birthday commemorative memento.

We have included with our statement recent editorials related to the Bicentennial numismatic issues. "Distant Drums Comes Nearer" (Coin World, May 26, 1971) and "Hobby Gets A Voice" which appears in the current edition of Coin World. With your permission we will include them in the record as further background.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee and present our views on the medallic program to commemorate the American Revolution Bicentennial. Thank you most kindly.

#### BICENTENNIAL—RELATED MEDALS

Signers of the Declaration of Independence	25 platinum, 75000 serial numbered silver, .999 fine, \$11; bronze, \$2.75.	Presidential Arts Medals, Englewood, Ohio 45322.
Gallery of Great Americans	Subscription series, Franklin Mint.	Sterling silver \$8.75; bronze, \$3.50.
Hall of Fame of Great Americans, Coin and Currency Institute		
Statue of Liberty, Castle Clinton, American Museum of Immigration, Federal Hall.	.900 fine, 1 5/16", struck at U.S. Mint, 4 for \$39.95. 2 1/2" bronze by Medallic Art, \$19.95.	International Numismatic Agency, 127 East 59 St., New York, N.Y. 10022.
Crispus Attucks Medal.	Subscription only.	American Neg. Comm. Soc.
Bicentennial of Boone's Entry into Kentucky.	Sterling silver \$12; Franklinium \$3.	Daniel Boone Festival, Box 770, Barboursville, Ky. 40906.
Uncle Sam Memorial Medal.	Pure silver \$15.45; bronze \$2.58.	Suburban National Bank, 856 Massachusetts Ave., Arlington, Mass. 02174.
Bedford, Mass., Flag Medal.	2,000—999 fine \$19.50; sterling silver, \$12.50; bronze, \$3.	Bedford Minute Men Co., Box 1775, Bedford, Mass. 01730.
Bicentennial, Wolfeboro, N.H.	1,000 sterling silver, \$10; gold-plated bronze, \$4.	Chamber of Commerce, Wolfeboro, N.H. 03894.
Green Ville Treaty Medal.	Base Metal, \$1.50.	Garst Museum, Greenville, Ohio 45331.
Carlisle Colonial Minute Men, 6 medals 1970-75.	1 platinum; 1,000 S.S., \$10; bronze, \$2. 1 3/8" diameter.	Estabrook Medals, Box 1775, Carlisle, Mass. 01741.
200th Anniversary, Carpenters Hall.	Philadelphia Tourist Bureau.	
Uncle Sam Sesquicentennial.	76 mm. bronze \$4.75; 5,000 pure silver.	Medallic Distributors, Box 129, Penfield, N.Y.
Independence Hall.	40 mm. pure silver \$12.50; palladium \$250; platinum \$1,250.	Americana Medal Series, American Mint Associates, Medina, Pa.
Boston Massacre.	500—999 silver \$15; 5,000 nickel-silver \$3.	U.S. Coinage Corp., Box 144, Prudential Center Stat., Boston, Mass. 02199.
Washington Monument, Jefferson Memorial, Lincoln Memorial.	2,500 silver Proofs, 3 for \$47.45 pp.	International Numismatic Agency, 96 Prince St., New York, N.Y. 10012.
Patrick Henry.	Silver, bronze.	G. A. Hall of Fame Coin and Currency Inst.
Washington Crossing the Delaware.	National Comm. Society.	Subscription.
Paul Revere.	do.	Do.
Thomas Jefferson.	do.	Do.
Ben Franklin.	do.	Do.
John Paul Jones.	do.	Do.
Daniel Boone.	do.	Do.
Patrick Henry.	do.	Do.
Boston Tea Party.	do.	Do.
Alexander Hamilton.	do.	Do.
Mount Rushmore.	do.	Do.
Nathan Hale.	do.	Do.
Molly Pitcher.	Societe Comm. de Femmes Celebres.	Do.

Betsy Ross	Societe Comm. de Femmes Celebres	Subscription.
Washington	International Fraternal Comm. Society	Do.
John Hancock	do	Do.
Ben Franklin	do	Do.
Paul Revere	do	Do.
John Paul Jones	do	Do.
Lafayette	do	Do.
Ethan Allen	do	Do.
Washington	FM Presidential Series	Commercial.
Adams	do	Do.
Declaration of Independence	FM History of the United States	Do.
Betsy Ross—1777	do	Do.
Valley Forge—1788	do	Do.
John Paul Jones—1779	do	Do.
French Army Joins United States at Newport, R.I., 1780	do	Do.
British Surrender—1781	do	Do.
Articles of Peace—1782	do	Do.
Washington leaves Army—1783	do	Do.
Congress Ratifies Peace—1784	do	Do.
U.S. Constitution Approved—1787	do	Do.
U.S. Constitution Ratified—1788	do	Do.
Washington Inauguration—1789	do	Do.
Mount Vernon	FM Landmarks of America	Do.
Independence Hall	do	Do.
Old Ironsides	do	Do.
Paul Revere	FM Famous Facts and Faces	Do.
John Paul Jones	do	Do.
Ben Franklin	do	Do.
George Washington	do	Do.
U.S. Bicentennial, Colorado Centennial	Nickel-silver \$10, Franklin Mint	Colorado Coin Foundation, Inc., Box 1499, Denver, Colo. 80901.
Thomas Jefferson	1 3/4" silver \$3.00; 1 3/4" bronze (7,500) \$14.00; 3" bronze \$6.00.	Hall of Fame for Great Americans, Coin and Currency Institute, 393 Seventh Ave., New York, N.Y. 10001.
Patrick Henry	do	Do.
George Washington	do	Do.
George Washington (Presidential)	3" bronze \$5.25; 1 3/8" \$0.60	Superintendent, U.S. Mint, Philadel- phia, Pa. 19106.
John Adams (Presidential)	do	Do.
Thomas Jefferson (Presidential)	do	Do.
Alexander Hamilton (Secretary of Treasury)	3" bronze \$5.25	Do.
David Rittenhouse (Director of Mint)	do	Do.
Washington before Boston (Army)	2 3/4" bronze \$6.25	Do.
General Gates at Saratoga	2 3/8" bronze \$6.25	Do.
General Morgan for Cowpens	2 3/8" bronze \$6.25	Do.
Lieutenant Colonel Howard, Cowpens	1 3/4" bronze \$6.25	Do.
Lieutenant colonel W. A. Washington, Cowpens	do	Do.
Count DeFleury, Stony Point	1 9/16" bronze \$6.25	Do.
General Anthony Wayne, Stony Point	2 1/16" bronze \$6.25	Do.
General Nathaniel Greene, Eutaw Springs	2 1/4" bronze \$6.25	Do.
Major Henry Lee, Paulus Hook	1 13/16" bronze \$6.25	Do.
John Paul Jones	2 1/4" bronze \$6.25	Do.
Captain Thomas Truxton	do	Do.
Washington: "Time Increases His Fame"	1 5/16" bronze	Do.
Washington	1 3/16" bronze \$1.10	Do.
Cabinet of Mint Medals 1859	2 5/16" bronze \$5.25	Do.
Washington Holiday Medal "Presi- dency Relinquished"	1 9/16" bronze \$5.25	Do.
Washington/Jackson Medallion	1 1/16" bronze \$1.10	Do.
Washington/Lincoln Medallion	do	Do.
Washington/Grant Medallion	do	Do.
Washington/Wreath Medallion	do	Do.
Washington Bicentennial	2 1/4" bronze \$5.25	Do.
Valley Forge Centennial	1 9/16" bronze \$5.25	Do.
Heroes of the American Revolution	32 mm silver, bronze, platinum. 50- medal series.	Franklin Mint, Franklin Center, Pa. 19063 (Subscription only.)
Thomas Jefferson	2 7/8" bronze, subscription only	Subscription, 74th issue 1967 Society of Medalists, West Branch Rd., Weston, Conn. 06880.
200th Anniversary of the Boston Massacre	Cover including medal minted at the Franklin Mint, Historical Flag Stamp Series used, 200 issued.	Post-Marked History, Box 1907, Panama City, Fla. 32401.
U.S.A. Flag Tribute	2 medal set. 24K gold, 500 sets. \$49.95. Solid sterling silver \$39.95. Solid bronze, mint quality, \$12.95.	International Numismatic Agency, 96 Prince St., New York, N.Y. 10012.
National Bi-Centennial Medal Series	Series consists of 12 medals—2 to be issued each year starting 1971 through 1976.	Dirigo Medals, 81 85 Cony St., Augusta, Maine 04330.
The Age of the American Revolution	Double-struck, sterling silver, edge- numbered and registered.	The Historic Mint of Long Island, Ltd., 9 Northern Blvd., Greenvale, L.I., N.Y. 11548.
Highlights of the Age of the American Revolution	do	Do.



## ADDENDUM

Patriots Hall of Fame.....	100 medals and plaques honoring our great patriots. Issued in groups of 20 by the Franklin Mint.	Subscription.
Philadelphia Sesquicentennial Commemorative Medal.	1—Ribault's Monument; 2—Jacksonville's namesake, Andrew Jackson; 3—Racing yacht, America; 4—1st RR bridge across the St. Johns River; 5—Jacksonville Fire.	Wendell's of Minneapolis, Minn. Issued in a limited number.
Philadelphia Bicentennial Commemorative.	Struck in sterling silver and Franklin bronze.	Issued by the Tourist Bureau of Philadelphia and the Continental Bank.
Document of Freedom, Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.	3d in continuing series of medallic sets. 24-karat gold on pure silver; solid bronze mint quality, solid sterling silver Proof quality.	Franklin Mint.
Bedford Flag Cover and Medal.....	Full color enamel inlay. 25 covers in bronze and 2 in silver.	Struck by V. H. Blackinton, Attleboro Falls, Mass.
200 Years of Independence Shield 1776-1976 silver bar.		Harry J. Forman, Inc., Box 5756, Philadelphia, Pa. 19120.

[From Coin World, May 26, 1971]

## DISTANT DRUMS COME NEARER

Two of the most influential lawmakers in Washington have introduced bills to provide for the striking of up to 14 national medals to commemorate the nation's 200th birthday, which occurs in 1976.

Senator John Sparkman (D-Ala.) Chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, heads the sponsorship of legislation in the Senate. Congressman Wright Patman (D-Texas) who heads the House banking and Currency Committee, leads the movement in the House of Representatives.

What more could the numismatic fraternity ask in the way of promise that the American Revolution Bicentennial medallic commemoration can be glorious?

We are pleased to see the proposed measures include recommendations and background supplied by an advisory panel on coins and medals convened by the ARB Commission.

The purists applaud the provisions to have national medals—one official piece and up to 13 annual medals—struck by the United States Mint.

Private minting industry will have the opportunity to participate in the production of the 50 state medals and an awards medal to be used as an ARBC presentation piece.

Devotees of the newest collecting hobby meld—numismatic-philatelic covers—will have annual opportunities to add to their collections, perhaps even until 1983!

The 1971 program, dogged by snags along the way, some necessary and others unnecessary in our opinion, must be considered as a low gear operation for what is to come during the next few years. At the moment, with the enabling legislation apparently well on its way to enactment, we are eyeing a feverish timetable. We do not envy the Mint its task of producing the 1971 Bicentennial medals by July 4, with one hand while it strikes the Eisenhower dollars with the other, along with a few billion coins for the economy.

Now that every faction seeking to be involved in the ARBC medallion program ought to be satisfied at the prospects, we turn our thoughts to other considerations: The art and quality of these medals must be true and fine, reflecting honor, dignity, gloriousness and stateliness of the occasion. We urge strongest control and continuous consultation with the nation's finest experts in numismatic art.

The coinage program is already under way unofficially, with one official bill under study—Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho) introduced a bill in April to provide for silver Proof and Uncirculated coin sets in 1976 to commemorate the bicentennial. We will look forward to further developments in the coinage program recommendations.

Now that both the Senate and the House have taken initial action, and we are past the first hurdle toward a 200th birthday numismatic program, we would be remiss if we didn't pay tribute to some hard-working ARBC members and staffers, along with the panel members from our own fraternity, led by George E. Lang, who helped bring it about.

Especially do we recognize the strong leadership of David J. Mahoney, ARBC chairman, the commitment of M. L. Spector and Hugh A. Hall, executive director and deputy executive director, and Patrick Butler, who so brilliantly staffed the numismatic program.

[From Coin World, July 7, 1971]

## HOBBY GETS A VOICE

Thanks to a good friend of numismatics, Congresswoman Leonore K. Sullivan (D-Mo.), the hobby-science will have a significant voice at hearings of her Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, scheduled for Tuesday, June 29, in Washington.

At this time Mrs. Sullivan's subcommittee will be studying H.R. 7987, a bill Congressman Wright Patman (D-Texas) chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee introduced May 3 with Mrs. Sullivan and Congressman William B. Widnall (R-N.J.). A companion bill was introduced in the Senate May 4. This legislation authorizes the striking of national medals commemorating the bicentennial of the American Revolution.

Not only has Mrs. Sullivan invited spokesman for numismatics in general and from the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission's coins and medals advisory panel specifically, she has asked spokesmen for the full ARBC commission, for private manufacturers of medals, and for the state bicentennial commissions.

It will be a fair and square hearing. That's the way Mrs. Sullivan operates. She has watched over numismatic affairs with a strong, stern eye since the jurisdiction of the Mint became the affair of her committee in 1963.

Those of us who have had the privilege of studying the activities of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs as background for news stories and features know well this strength and sternness evidenced by the Subcommittee and Mrs. Sullivan, especially in the realm of commemorative coins.

Long an opponent of commemorative coins because of past abuses, Mrs. Sullivan has changed her position. At last summer's American Numismatic Association convention in St. Louis, she advocated a commemorative coin in honor of the nation's 200th birthday.

The June 29 hearings, however, were to be concerned only with national medals produced under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, but an exciting, broad medallic program commemorating the Bicentennial, already well underway, was expected to be examined during testimony before the lawmakers.

Coin World will be sharing developments at the hearings with its readers in a familiar "You Are There" feature next week.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mrs. Russell.  
Mr. Krause?

#### STATEMENT OF CHESTER L. KRAUSE, IOLA, WIS., PUBLISHER OF NUMISMATIC NEWS

Mr. KRAUSE. I have a prepared statement. Also, I submitted earlier a position paper of our firm, which you can include in the record.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Both of them will be included in the record.

Mr. KRAUSE. But I will refer to a couple of passages in my prepared statement.

Sitting here this morning—we seem to raise two issues. First, we are all concerned with the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission really projecting an image of what we have done, or what we have accomplished in the 200 years. Then the underlying thing that comes to the surface is the profit, the dollars, which can be generated from a bicentennial medal program to celebrate our birthday.

Too often, I believe, especially in our coinage, we are hesitant to remember that we are projecting an image through the presence of the great statesmen that appear on our coinage. By the fact that they circulate by the billions, literally, they are doing a great job of protecting that image. When we consider the overall medallic commemoration or numismatic commemoration, we should never forget this. I know that you are going to consider this specific question of commemorative



coins at a later time, as there are people that are going to come to you and ask for such issues to be authorized. We have researched some of the facts in that area, and I might just pick that out of our prepared testimony.

In the current fiscal year, there are something like 8.7 billion coins being produced, with a face value of around \$390 million, at a cost of production of about \$14 million, giving you a seigniorage of \$377 million. Now, we just project the cost of production against a probable 10-percent increase in coinage, and we would have some 37 million in additional seigniorage. When I say this, I am sure that if you would turn our Nation's coinage into a commemorative issue, that is, the entire series, you would have no difficulty in increasing the number of coins that people are going to put aside by this amount. That would provide some stimulus and work hand-in-glove with any medal program, both public or private, that would come through. It would bring to the people, to the grassroots people, the evidence that we are celebrating our 200th anniversary.

Our submissions here will, in effect, say that we support—and I am projecting the views of our readers, I am sure—that we should have a national medal and it probably should end there.

To get into the many and various things which have been suggested, really, as we see it, you are embarking on a basically fundraising project. It seems as if ARBC wants to get into the medal program immediately as a matter of getting some funds. I appreciate this.

I would like to point out that in the case of most successful medal programs silver is very often used to enhance a multimetal program. It not only provides those desirous of acquiring the medallion struck in a rare metal but will have an increase sale on the medals struck, lesser grade metal too. Many collect medals in all metals.

I certainly appreciate the opportunity of being here, to help update from 1963 commemorative coin and medal thinking. I might also bring out that in that time the numismatic hobby has come quite a way. At that time you probably heard little if anything from the numismatic community. I certainly appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you, Madam Chairman, and members of the committee.

Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Krause with attachment follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHESTER L. KRAUSE, IOLA, WIS., PUBLISHER OF  
NUMISMATIC NEWS WEEKLY, COINS MAGAZINE AND COIN PRICES

Madam Chairman and members of your committee: I am pleased to appear before you today in support of a national medal issue to mark the bicentennial of the American Revolution as called for in H.R. 7987. Certainly the commemoration of our great country's 200th birthday in 1976 is an event of the greatest national importance, and thus befitting of the best in official numismatic commemoration.

I can think of no better way to record the spectacular achievements of this nation than through the offering of medallie memorials . . . encompassing both commemorative medals and coins of the realm. Medals and coins have been used in combination to record—in a semi-indestructible state—most major events of recorded history. Coins, which came first, have been serving this function since several centuries before the birth of Christ.

The basic bill before us today is concerned with the official medal program which will be carried forth by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. I doubt seriously that a dissenting voice can be found within these

walls on the question of the issue of a national medal for our 200th birthday. Beyond that simple question, however, serious consideration must be given to the extent to which national medals should be issued, and what profits, both tangible and intangible, can be derived from such an undertaking.

In appraising the proper direction for the nation's official bicentennial medal program, we must assess the relative potential for both coin and medal recognition of the event. In so doing, three vital questions must be raised and answered. When are coinage commemoratives appropriate? When should national medals be issued? When should the federal government leave to private enterprise and the states the option to sponsor medals?

In the case of our nation's coinage we must start by defining its function. Everyone in this room will agree, I am sure, that the prime function of coinage is to serve society as a medium of exchange. In the fiscal year just ending our mints produced 8.7 billion coins in maintaining an estimated \$5 billion worth of coins in circulation.

Each and every coin in circulation performs a vital secondary function, however, in projecting the image of our great country through the portraits they carry. These great Americans epitomize the untold millions who have toiled unrelentingly in expanding our great ideal of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. By their presence day after day, week after week, and through the years delivers the message we are all continually striving to deliver.

Medals, too, can provide a worthy vehicle for projecting the American ideal but, unlike coins which pass from hand to hand each day, most repose in the original owners possession. They are admired and cherished, especially if they have official sanction, but in general they tell their story only to the owner. The issue of a national medal for our bicentennial celebration would set the event apart as one of great national importance.

Here I must interject the observation that the issue of national, Congressionally sanctioned, medals has not been maintained on the proper plane of integrity. In the recent past a fair number of the medals have noted events which were hardly "national" in stature. At the same time some subjects, like the first transcontinental railroad, merited the issue of commemorative coins, which series the national medals were originally launched to replace. It is time that the ban which prohibits commemorative coins be reconsidered.

Let us now take a look at the profits—both tangible and intangible—which might be reaped from bicentennial coin and medal programs. A national medal could certainly be sold in relatively large quantities if properly marketed. It would record for posterity our bicentennial celebration in a semi-indestructible form, and it would provide a return, though nominal, in the form of direct profit.

In the case of coinage, no direct profit could accrue to the Bicentennial Commission. However, the market potential through the sale of mint and proof sets to coin collectors and the general public would be greatly amplified, and the seigniorage that would be realized from the millions of pieces of regular coinage which would be absorbed by the public would far surpass any direct profits which could accrue from even a comprehensive multi-medal program on which the ultimate potential would be realized.

An illustration of the seigniorage potential may be realized by studying the current fiscal year's 8.7 billion coin production, the face value of which is \$391,160,000 against a total cost of only \$13,896,000, leaving seigniorage profits of \$377,264,000. Carrying out a 10 percent increase in production and costs, and the seigniorage increases by \$37,726,400. And, none of these figures take into account the new Eisenhower dollar.

Then there is that vital secondary function of our coinage again. The untold billions of exposures which coins receive each day makes any comparison of image building potentiality with medals meaningless. When you talk of medal sales, 100,000 is a figure seldom achieved, but with coins the appetite of the public reaches well into the millions.

It is reasonable to assume that as specialists in making coins, our mints could literally produce an unlimited number of coins. Certainly, given the direction of this committee, they could generate the stockpile required for the issue of a circulating bicentennial coinage series. For the opposite reason they should not be saddled with the responsibility for a series of medal issues.

The concentration on a single official national medal tribute would engender far greater exposure, as getting a single item into the hands of thousands of people will perform a better mission than will the sale of a dozen items to far fewer people. It is an old axiom that quantity dilutes quality.



In summing up I would answer the three questions posed earlier as follows: Any event tied to the heritage of all Americans merits commemoration on the nation's coinage, and the bicentennial merits an entirely new series of coin of the realm issues. Events which are national in stature merit national medals. Events of regional, state or local importance should be allowed to remain outside the federal realm of numismatic commemoration.

Madam Chairman: I want to thank you and your committee for allowing me to present these views today.

---

#### A PLAN OF DIRECTION FOR AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL NUMISMATIC ACTIVITIES

A STAFF STUDY PREPARED BY THE EDITORS OF NUMISMATIC NEWS WEEKLY—COINS  
MAGAZINE—COIN PRICES

##### *Basic objectives*

The ARBC's numismatic activities should be aimed at the projection of the national heritage and image. We find that the consensus of the outline presented with the present draft legislation is focused on the fund raising or "business" possibilities offered through the launching of a comprehensive medal program. It is our firm belief that this is both unfortunate and improper.

It seems basic logic that the ARBC can better carry out its tasks of presenting a many faceted historical program by obtaining funding through Congressional appropriations than through reliance on the rather uncertain possibilities of a grandiosely envisioned "official" medal program. This is to be, after all, a federal, patriotic celebration; it is not, or certainly should not be, a commercially based endeavor.

It must be seriously questioned if the fund raising possibilities which are certainly envisioned for the medal program could be achieved. The proposals offered would involve the launching of complex marketing considerations which could be outside the ability of the ARBC to handle. We firmly believe that any "official" medal program should be handled internally, without entering into franchised distribution and related arrangements.

##### *Alternative program*

As mentioned previously, the ARBC's numismatic activities should be aimed at selling and reselling the American ideal, or projecting the national image. No media can be better used to achieve this task with the masses than coins of the realm. A range of five or six coins will better achieve this ARBC objective than will the issue of a series of any number of medals. Every citizen would be exposed to circulating bicentennial coins, only a select few to the medals.

There can be no logical argument with the institution of a new series of coin designs to coincide with the observance of the nation's bicentennial celebration. Such an issue should, in fact, be considered a mandatory requirement by the President, Congress and the Treasury. There are a multitude of precedents for such an issue, the closest and most recent being Canada's centennial coinage of 1967.

The United States should also follow another lead provided by its neighbor to the north and utilize currency to further project the bicentennial theme. Again, a logical argument against a limited program in this area can not be constructed and successfully defended.

The ARBC should cap off its numismatic activities with the issue of an "official" medal. This issue should be struck at the United States Mint. It should be made available to the public in not more than four versions. This basic piece should also be utilized for award medal presentation pieces.

##### *Funding*

The subject of funding must not be completely dismissed. The fact is, however, that although an ARBC medal program would raise physical funds to help finance its other activities, a commemorative coin-currency program would indirectly raise much more through seigniorage. Without attempting to draw upon vulnerable and often misleading statistics, it can be observed that the total profits which the government can realize through seigniorage on such a program would exceed, by an almost unbelievable margin, any profit which could be achieved through the sale of medals.

A medal program would require the expenditure of large sums for advertising and promotion, while in the case of a coin-currency program the costs in this area would be negligible. The preparation costs for either program would be about equal. The publicity which would naturally gravitate to the coin-currency issues, in both the media and general public interest, would greatly exceed that which would be accorded any type of a medal program, as their legal standing makes coins much more impressive to the general public than medals.

The coin-currency program approach would demand that the funds raised directly by the ARBC's numismatic activities be of a rather modest nature. The bulk of the "profits" would accrue to the government in seigniorage and set sales, which would benefit the general treasury.

### *Coins*

The ARBC should give first priority to the achievement of a very comprehensive bicentennial coin program. This opportunity could be approached from many angles. The most desirable would certainly be the offering of a completely redesigned range of coins for circulation. The public's interest in, and appetite for such a program could probably be developed more fully through the issue of single special commemorative coin issues annually relating to the Revolution, commencing at the first opportunity and carrying through 1975.

Logically, all coin sales under such a plan should be allowed to rest with the Treasury's Bureau of the Mint. The Mint, which at the present distributes about three million proof sets a year and is currently embarked on the much larger Eisenhower dollar program, would be able to program and distribute many millions of special commemorative issues and bicentennial proof sets. Its program could be adapted to such requirements with relative ease. Such individual coins and sets should be housed in plush cases and marketed at a modestly increased price.

The increased production capacity presently available through the Mint should provide the liquidity necessary for the introduction of an annual series (one issue per year) of historically significant commemorative halves or dollars. Such a series would provide a natural lead-in for developing the highest degree of interest in the bicentennial coinage.

These special commemoratives should be offered under a plan basically like that under which proof sets are currently offered. They should be offered individually at \$2 or \$3 each, or in special cased proof sets priced at \$8 to \$10. The elements of restricted availability and reasonable pricing would assure that the pieces would become "collectors items" and benefit by the commercial activity which they would evoke.

The bicentennial coinage should be ready for release in early January of 1976 for maximum impact. To achieve this end the Mint would be required to place the coins in production well in advance and stockpile them for nationwide release. The precedent for such a move, involving non-calendar year dating of U.S. coins, was established in 1965-66 during the national coin shortage.

### *Design*

It would be most desirable to have the bicentennial coinage reflect completely new designs on both sides of each coin. At the same time, of course, the portraits of Lincoln, Jefferson, Roosevelt, Washington and Kennedy could simply be tied to new reverse designs projecting the American image and carrying the 1776-1976 commemorative dates. The year date of issue would be carried on the obverse as usual.

The competition for designs should be on an "open" rather than "closed" basis. Such a course, open to all American designers and sculptors, would not only provide more possibilities, it would also engender more interest in the overall program. It is not germane to be concerned that the "finer sculptors" might not enter an "open" competition. Any worthy design can be easily converted to models by any relatively competent coin sculptor.

In this regard it is most important to note, in fact, that one of the most important considerations in evolving a successful bicentennial coinage program is to provide for the preparation of the final models by a coin sculptor. There is a world of difference between normal and medallist sculpturing and coin sculpturing. The latter is an art mastered by few sculptors. The rendering of the art must be made to be fully compatible with high speed coinage requirements, and few fine arts people are aware of such demands.

One of the most serious drawbacks to the Canadian centennial program of 1967 revolved around the fact that the competition for the designs specified that



the artist also convert them to models. The late head of the Royal Canadian Mint, Norval Parker, once informed us that this fact seriously hampered the successful execution of the program. The artist, for instance, insisted that dots be used to represent hair on the rabbit, while production requirements demand lines. A number of similar examples can be drawn from U.S. coinage history.

#### *Paper money*

The ARBC should also make a concerted effort to effect the introduction of a special bicentennial one dollar bill, as did Canada in 1967. There is not a sound basis for the rejection of such an issue. The face of the present note could be retained, with the back to be given over to a Revolutionary War vignette. The bicentennial dates 1776-1976 could be incorporated on the face, perhaps in place of the serial number on a special issue.

The position which finds that changes in the design of our currency are undesirable because unfamiliarity with new designs creates an atmosphere for increased counterfeiting does not apply to the one dollar note. The fact is that one's are seldom the subject of counterfeiters, most of whom concentrate on the \$5, \$10 and \$20 denominations. It is to be noted that approximately 70 percent of our circulating notes are in the one dollar denomination.

Like a bicentennial coinage, a bicentennial note issue should also be released in early January of 1976. Thus, advance preparation would again be required. Studies have shown that the average life of a one dollar note is 18 months, so they should be produced and placed in circulation early enough so the bicentennial notes are dominant in circulation by July 4, 1976. This note would have to be the same size as at present.

#### *Medals*

The ARBC should issue an "official" medal, but only one, which should be offered to the public in four distinct versions. It should under no circumstance undertake to embark on a broad based medal program involving "series" or "officially sanctioned" issues. All but the single national issue should be evolved by the lower level units concerned, in concert with private enterprise.

The official medal should be issued in two sizes and two metals; dollar and medallion (2½ to 3 inch) size, in both bronze and silver. All but the small bronze issue, and perhaps the large bronze piece, should be produced in preannounced quantities or under ordering deadlines, with release to come on July 4, 1975. The small bronze piece should be an attractively priced, unlimited issue.

These medals should be produced by the U.S. Mint, if at all possible. If necessary, this production, or any portion thereof, could be farmed out to private industry so the Mint could concentrate on inauguration of the comprehensive coinage program. Distribution of the "official" medal should definitely rest solely in the hands of the ARBC, although such units as the nation's banking system or post offices could be engaged to pinpoint distribution.

#### *Summary*

Two vital points must be made about the program which we have outlined. It would both allow for the creation of "collectors items" and at the same time it would place the "official" numismatic commemoration of the bicentennial on the highest possible plane. We feel the most important function of the ARBC should be the projection of the ideals of our great nation. The ARBC legislative proposal unfortunately places too much emphasis on "fund raising" rather than the "historic" base of the celebration with which it is concerned.

The program consensus projected in the draft legislation would put the ARBC "in business," regardless of the nature of distribution. The outline presented in this paper would, in our opinion, properly balance government and private participation in the task of bicentennial commemoration. A broader medal program could kill off not only the private sector, but the grandiosely envisioned "official" medal program. In all, there will be several thousand medals issued to commemorate the bicentennial, if one uses as a guide the fact that around 2,000 have been chronicled for the 1876 centennial.

In suggesting the circulating series of 1976 bicentennial commemorative coins and the note, we would leave open to the Treasury the option of utilizing the designs for one year or incorporating them as "standard" designs after 1976. Canada, of course, offered their centennial coins for one year only, then reverted to the former designs. The latter course would be preferable from many standpoints.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We are very happy to have both of you because I think you have both given us excellent information as to the interest of the public in numismatic materials. I am familiar with both of your papers, and I know the good work you have done to get out information on this bill to the people, because, of course, the information has to go to them in order to interest them in buying the medals. I want to say, too, that I strongly support the idea of having special bicentennial coins, perhaps just for the year 1976; but you people are going to have to work on the Secretary of the Treasury to get behind that, because we have received no indications as yet of the administration's views on special bicentennial coins. But I think it is a good idea.

Are there any questions?

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. WYLIE. I would just like, if I may, Madam Chairman, to acknowledge the presence of a fellow "Buckeye" here this morning.

I am sorry you are not a constituent of mine, but I am sure that Congressman McCulloch appreciated you being here.

Mrs. RUSSELL. He is a very dear friend.

Mr. WYLIE. I am sure he is.

I have nothing else to say except that I think that Mrs. Russell and Mr. Krause did make a significant contribution to the deliberations of this committee.

Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Williams?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. Russell, I observed your comment to the staff of the ARBC. Apparently the staff of the panel on medals contacted you about a year ago. I would like to say to you that I am familiar with semipublic bodies where they depend on the staffs to make many of the decisions. I think one of the many exceptions to that type of organization is the National Commission on Consumer Finance which Mrs. Sullivan and I both belong. We recently had 2 days of hearings and the public members were very faithful. We didn't see a number of the Senators or Congressmen. I hope that this isn't the case as far as ARBC is concerned, where the staff is going to work and makes the decisions, and the ARBC members catch up with things a little bit later.

But you state that we are lagging behind in this country in the production of medals. I agree with you as far as the quality of production, as far as the U.S. Mint is concerned, but I disagree vigorously as far as our private mints are concerned. It is just not true. New methods have been developed for producing commemorative medals by private mints. They are among the best produced anywhere in the world.

Mrs. RUSSELL. Excuse me, sir. I think if you read my testimony, you will find that in several instances I praise the private mints and give them great credit for their accomplishments in the medallic art field. I say that most private mints are so accomplished and highly skilled, and as a matter of fact, there is some comfort in the fact that if for some unforeseen reason the mint could not serve in the production and distribution of national medallions, a substitute is waiting in the wings. Also in another place I praise private industry, the private minting facilities, "the outstanding artistic production and enterprise of private medal-producing firms in the United States has brought about a whole new focus of public attention upon the medal and its powers as a vehicle to portray and educate."



Mr. WILLIAMS. Actually, there seems to be very little difference in the position taken by you and Mr. Krause, and that of the two previous witnesses, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Gibbs. On page 2 of your testimony, you state: "The best medal ever seen by the American public should emerge as a representation of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commemorative." I certainly agree with you, you are actually talking about the one best medal and I agree with that. I have no quarrel with the U.S. Mint producing a national commemorative medal for the bicentennial. You also go on to say in your statement at the bottom of page 3—you refer to privately produced bicentennial numismatic items, and you refer also to the 50 States. The two gentlemen that appeared here prior to you were espousing that very same idea, one national medal produced by the U.S. Mint, and then medals produced by the individual States.

Mrs. RUSSELL. Congressman Williams, I am surprised that in all of this testimony, it hasn't come out that the ARBC coins and medals panel has considered preparing a kit, an advisory kit, and including potential manufacturers of State medals, and suggested procedures, fundraising guidelines, and that sort of thing, in the kit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was this kit ever prepared?

Mrs. RUSSELL. Not to my knowledge. It was discussed, however.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was discussed. Was any conclusion reached?

Mrs. RUSSELL. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, they just discussed it and forgot about it.

Mrs. RUSSELL. I couldn't say that they forgot about it. It could be very much in the works. I am not sure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. I would just like to compliment both witnesses. Mrs. Russell intrigued me to the point where you have perhaps a numismatist in the making here on the committee. I want to compliment you. I really feel that you have added a very interesting dimension. If we had the time, I would like to hear your description of what would be the aesthetic designs or criteria which you can use in the design of these medallions. I do feel that your contribution this morning has been unique and has certainly been worthwhile waiting for.

Mrs. RUSSELL. Thank you, Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you. Thank you both for coming.

We will recess until 1:45, I understand that one of the remaining witnesses must catch a plane at 2:45. We will promise him that he will be free in time to catch that plane. We will recess until 1:45.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., a recess was taken until 1:45 p.m. on the same date.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

Now, we will hear from three gentlemen whose opinions and views on this legislation and on the general subject of national medals are of importance to the subcommittee, not only in connection with H.R. 7987, but in connection with future bills dealing with national medals: Mr. William Louth of Medallie Arts Co., Mr. Michael Cerullo, of the Robbins Co., and Mr. Joseph Segal of the Franklin Mint.

Would you gentlemen come up to the witness table together?

As I explained in my opening statement, gentlemen, this hearing was originally scheduled primarily to give you people an opportunity to be heard on a matter which I think greatly affects your firms, and the industry.

Mr. Cerullo, since you are the one who must leave, we will start with you. Then if we have any questions that we want to ask you, we will do so, and then you may be excused. But we will try to keep within, say, 15 minutes. You can briefly summarize your testimony, if you will, so that it will give us more chance to ask questions.

**STATEMENT OF MICHAEL C. CERULLO, JR., DIRECTOR OF COMMEMORATIVE ISSUES, THE ROBBINS CO., ATTLEBORO, MASS.**

Mr. CERULLO. Thank you, Madam Chairman, for this opportunity and for your accommodation.

My statement is short and to the point. I think what we say in substance is that the Commission and its advisory panel have come up with a set of proposals which we believe resulted in a remarkably well-balanced comprehensive, and above all a pair of recommendations. We believe that the two recommendations that they have made that are covered by H.R. 7987 will be shown in the future to be most critical to preserving the spirit, the dignity, and the significance of the events, ideas, and the cumulative heritage which they are being asked to symbolize. We have substantiated our agreement with the program on historical, economic, marketing, and government free enterprise relations bases, and we think it really remarkable for a commission or its advisory panel charged with the responsibility of bringing together, not only private manufacturers and hobbyists who have their own peculiar interest, the distribution community that services that marketplace, and the scholars in the numismatic field—to bring all of those interests together, and to bring the overriding interest of the American public into the picture, and then to come up with what I have termed a well-balanced program that coordinates all of these elements remarkably well.

We have made some suggestions in our proposal. One relates to the awards medal. I think that that suggestion stands on its own. As I heard from earlier testimony, there has been some concern for the cost or the acquisition value of the medals that are covered by H.R. 7987.

We have made a suggestion with regard to the content that the committee might suggest to the Commission regarding the possibility that one of the medals, or one of the materials in which the medals would be offered, could be struck in a recycled material such as reprocessed beverage containers. We feel that because of the currency of the idea, the idea of responsibility to the environment because 55 or so percent of the American public that will be responding to this commemorative medal in 1976 have more than adequately presented their views regarding the question of values, that 55 or 53 percent being under 25, we feel that perhaps we can come up with not only a symbol that will be significant to the idea of America, but also substantially significant in terms of its makeup.



If I may just reinforce a couple of points I have heard today with regard to some of the testimony, I think that Mr. McKinney's comments relative to the potential in the marketplace for the medals, particularly the potential for the market, as regards the State medals which will be struck by private mints under the total set of recommendations, are significant. I think his perception is that of a professional marketing man. Certainly someone would like to be working with him if he were trying to sell medals.

The bicentennial era is going to do great things for the collecting community. We are a nation, it seems, of collectors. The stimulus that the national medal and the series of medals in numismatic-philatelic combination would provide to the imagination of the American public can only enhance the sale of other medals that will be struck by individual States, by organizations who have their specific perspective on American history, and who want to relate it in some enduring form. It will have a synergistic effect on the marketplace. We think that the Commission's recommendations or the advisory panel recommendations have been very responsive for their short-term exposure to the concept of marketing collectors' items; we think they have been very perceptive in what makes a good collector marketplace.

I think that substantially handles our testimony with regard to the bicentennial medals. It was not our understanding that this hearing would cover the more general question of when and under what circumstances the U.S. Mint should become involved in the striking of medals other than the bicentennial medal. We would like to reserve our comments on that and perhaps be allowed to submit some other statement at a future time. It wasn't our understanding that we should address ourselves to this question today.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Cerullo follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MICHAEL C. CERULLO, JR., DIRECTOR OF COMMEMORATIVE ISSUES, THE ROBBINS COMPANY, ATTLEBORO, MASS.

Madam Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for this opportunity to present our views concerning H.R. 7987 which provides for the striking of medals by the U.S. Mint to commemorate the BiCentennial of the American Revolution in accordance with two of the several recommendations submitted by the American Revolution BiCentennial Commission. (Commission)

First we applaud the members of the Commission, its Coins and Medals Advisory Panel under the chairmanship of Mr. George Lang, the staff of the Commission and the representatives of the various segments of the numismatic community and general public whose concentrated efforts over the past eighteen months have resulted in a remarkably well-balanced, comprehensive and, above all, fair series of recommendations.

Second, and lest a privately interested voice from some sylvan wilderness "proofs" us all otherwise, we would respectfully enumerate the specific reasons we concur with the substance of each of the Commissions' coins and medals recommendations and particularly those two provided for in H.R. 7987 which we believe future events will show to be most critical in preserving the spirit, dignity and significance of the event, idea and cumulative heritage they will symbolize.

Of the recommendations presented by the Commission, several deal with actual coinage and currency. To the purists' in the numismatic field, a positive action taken by the Congress on these recommendations will represent "the ultimate achievement" of their desires. For the private mints, medallic firms and numismatic business community, the very existence of coinage and currency specifically related to the BiCentennial, we believe, will do much to stimulate and expand the already substantial and growing market place for non-coin of the realm products and services.

As regards the Commission's recommendations for a national awards medal which would be presented to individuals and organizations whose activities in connection with the BiCentennial program merit recognition, we feel that the provisions for competitive bidding against specifications for its manufacture by a private mint or medallist presents each firm in the field with a fair and equitable opportunity to obtain the contract. We would ask that serious consideration be given to the nature and source of publicity releases regarding the award of this contract so as to preserve the dignity of the award and to avoid misleading the public as to the scope of the contract and the use of the metals produced under this contract.

In the recommendation (and we stress the word recommendation) regarding the several states' commemorative medals, we believe there is found some of the Commission's best balanced and perceptive thought. Both the interests of the private manufacturers and the interests of the individual states in the total potential marketplace for their BiCentennial medals are well served by this recommendation. Since at least fifty separate contracts would be available for competitive bidding should the several states so desire, the probability that the majority of medal manufacturers will obtain at least one BiCentennial contract is very great. Further, if each of the states in its wisdom chooses to relate the approximate dimension, material and acquisition value of their medals to the others, a "natural" medal series would in fact be created. There would doubtless be stimulation of the general public's collector instinct by coin dealers and album manufacturers to encourage the collection of the complete "natural" series. The effect on the market for an individual state's metal would be, in our opinion, synergistic and therefore beneficial to both the state and its medallist contractor.

The Above discussion of the Commission's recommendations is, we are aware, not immediately related to H.R. 7987. We believe, however, it can represent a viable context in which to view your alternatives regarding what we previously indicated may be "most critical in preserving the spirit, dignity and significance of the event" the medal(s) will be asked to symbolize.

The Commission has recommended that the U.S. Mint be authorized to strike a single national medal "commemorating the year 1776 and its significance to American independence" and a series of 6 to 13 medals which "may be struck to commemorate specific historical events of great importance recognized nationally as milestones in the continuing progress of the United States of America toward life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

These two recommendations, we believe, reflect the practicality and responsible foresight of the Commission in its efforts to provide a meaningful and obtainable medallist program to the American people and an historically significant, in-depth medallist perspective of the American Idea which future generations can look to in their reflections on our country as it presented itself to BiCentennial Americans.

Historically, the medallist form has been used by governments to commemorate events, achievements and ideas of significance, dignity and enduring value. Certainly it is historically appropriate to have such medals struck by the one mint which is owned by and responsible to the people it serves. To do otherwise would seem counterfeit.

Since the facilities are available and the capacity more than adequate, the economies of cost, scale and utilization of currently existing tax-payer owned and financed resources recommend this responsible approach.

Since the U.S. Mint's mailing list of coin and medal enthusiasts is the largest available and since the U.S. Mint has indicated approval of another government agency for the use of this list, the immediate marketing advantages would seem both practical and responsible in terms of the fiscal success of a BiCentennial medal program.

From a government/free-enterprise relations standpoint, we feel that the award of a contract to a single (or comparatively few) private mint(s) or medallist firm(s) would in this case represent the granting of monopolistic or near monopolistic public image power to the firm(s) obtaining the contract. The nature of the BiCentennial Era and its impact on the collecting field is and will continue to be very great. To provide one or a few medallist firms with the ability to present themselves to the public as the source of the Official BiCentennial Commemorative Medal(s) would we believe have severe restrictive and even destructive effects on a re-emerging industry by placing those firms who do not participate in the contract in a noncompetitive image position as regards all the other medal programs which will relate to the BiCentennial. Indeed, the vast majority of current programs now being marketed by private mints and medallist firms have some explicit or implicit BiCentennial tie in.



Beyond all this, it seems to us that the most important consideration is that which relates to the probable availability of actual coins and currency symbolizing the Bicentennial. Since the coins and currency recommendations will be the subject of other legislation and another hearing, the outcome of which is at best unpredictable, there is no certainty that such coinage and currency will be available for each American to have as his reminder of our country's 200 year history. Thus, we believe that the Commission's foresight in recommending that the U.S. Mint be authorized to strike the national medal and medal series is not only in the best interest of historical significance and numismatic purism, but most importantly, in the interest of every American who will desire an official and legitimate symbol of BiCentennial America.

In conclusion, it is our opinion that the opportunity to provide a meaningful symbol; to do so at a reasonable acquisition value and to do so in the framework of a near perfect relationship between the private citizen, his government and the free enterprise system is what the Commission's coin-medal recommendation will foster. We are before you today to support H.R. 7987 and ask that you report it favorably.

(The following supplemental remarks were received from Mr. Cerullo for inclusion in the record:)

The subcommittee might consider suggesting to the Commission that the medal and/or medal series could be offered to the public in a recycled material such as reprocessed aluminum beverage cans as well as in the more traditional materials. An advantage beyond those of light weight and low acquisition value would be the creation of a symbol significant in substance as well as design.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. It is perfectly all right, since you have heard the testimony of the others, if you want to add a comment on that. I think it would be helpful. What we want to develop are reasonable guidelines as to what proposed medals would be considered to be of sufficient national interest to warrant striking of national medals, so that in connection with future legislation on this issue, we can impose reasonable tests on the bills our colleagues in the House introduce and urge us to pass. We don't want this to get out of hand.

Mr. CERULLO. We will indeed be hard to come up with another national metal that will approach the significance of the 200th anniversary of our country's birth. I imagine that there will be arguments from various sources that will integrate that there perhaps can be another such medal. It may become a question of subjective judgment. However, when one gets to the establishment of an individual college, I think I would take exception to it. If one were to take a situation which might highlight the establishment of a constitutional precedent, an idea essential to the American way of life, and if one were to attempt to commemorate that, I think the U.S. Mint would have every right to strike a medal of that sort. As I indicate in our presentation regarding the bicentennial medal program, I think I state that to do otherwise is to seem counterfeit. I don't mean to pun, but, honestly, that is the way I feel.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Unintentionally, I neglected to give your Representative, Mrs. Heckler, an opportunity to introduce you. I apologize for that oversight. So I am going to forego questioning until Mrs. Heckler has a chance to greet you and start the questioning.

Mrs. HECKLER. I would certainly like to express my gratitude that you were able to accommodate the committee in meeting this afternoon. I know it was a personal inconvenience to you.

I am certainly proud to have a representative spokesman from the Robbins Co. before us. The Robbins Co. of Attleboro is an 80-year-old company that makes jewelry, coins, and medallions. Mr. Cerullo

is product development manager in charge of marketing for the International Mint, a subsidiary of Robbins, which makes coins and medallions for private collectors and for organizations.

The Robbins Co. has been selected by each group of Apollo astronauts to strike the commemorative medallions for the personal use of the astronauts. The medallions are presented by the astronauts and to those who work on the crews preparing and supervising the Apollo flights.

The Robbins Co. is one of the most distinguished companies in my district, and one well regarded for its quality of craftsmanship and workmanship. So, I would be prejudiced in your behalf, Mr. Cerullo, if I had not heard your testimony. But I must say that I truly feel that your suggestions have been rather innovative, and your testimony has added to the broad spectrum of opinion that we really must consider in terms of the legislation we have before us. We have heard from the mint and we have heard delightfully from the numismatists, and I think they all have a contribution. And I am intrigued by your suggestion for the use of recycling material, and I wonder how you would accommodate the need for some of the medals which have been suggested by Mrs. Russell, who spoke for the Coin World. Would you have a variety of medals available to the public for the commemoration? Are you considering the recycled material as the material for a specific medal?

Mr. CERULLO. Well, in point of fact, in bronze, a substantial portion of the material is recycled, and in point of fact, there is a substantial portion of the precious metal, as you well know, that is being used which is recycled. For many reasons, particularly the public's preoccupation with something new, something virginal to be involved with as an acquisition, no one has ever made this point. Now, my suggestion would be to offer one of the medals or one of the qualities in which the medal could be acquired in a material that would be specifically struck from recycled material. They would be in a sense certified recycled, with the idea of establishing the value of reuse, the ethics of responsible environmental policy. This communications venture that the bicentennial will represent over the next 5 to 10 years could do substantial things in that direction. And indeed, why shouldn't the symbol of the bicentennial, or one of the symbols of the bicentennial, be a substantial statement in that direction?

Mrs. HECKLER. I thank you very much, Mr. Cerullo.

I thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have just one comment before I recognize the other members to question you.

I want to comment that not all those that we hope will buy these souvenir medals are going to be confirmed coin or medal collectors. As Mrs. Russell said, we want children to buy them as something symbolic. But for the serious collectors, who have collections of various types of medals, it is going to be up to the Commission to say that we ought to have some of this and some of that and some of the other of the various types that they feel could be sold in the quantities they feel could be sold. I do think that your idea of using recycled materials could help, because it could be a very inexpensive thing.

Mr. Hanley, any questions?



Mr. HANLEY. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have no questions. I simply want to commend the gentleman for his excellent testimony, as evidenced by what I have heard and what I read.

So I want to express my personal appreciation to you for your contribution to the knowledge of the committee.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Mr. Williams?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I am familiar with the Robbins Co. I believe that basically the Robbins Co. manufactures jewelry; does it not?

Mr. CERULLO. The Robbins Co. has been for 80 years a manufacturer of emblematic awards, recognition, and motivational jewelry, and for the same approximately 80 years, it has been in the field of commemorative medal manufacture. I believe the first known example that we have is the medal commemorative of the 1900 Free St. Louis Exposition, although I may not be correct on that. Recently, in the past 2 years, we established a subsidiary which carried on the tradition of our medal-making activity into the area of marketing privately issued commemorative medal series on behalf of organizations and associations who have a message to present and want to do so in an enduring form. With the exception of our original American man in space series, all of our activities have been in this direction, that is, the organization is either approached or approaches us, and we provide them with a commemorative medal series, and an arrangement is made whereby they generate income to further their activity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the size of your international medal operation?

Mr. CERULLO. In what parameter would you like to have it, sir?

Mr. WILLIAMS. People.

Mr. CERULLO. People. The Robbins Co. has approximately 400 employees and the resources of both the Robbins Co. and the International Mint are used jointly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In your testimony you appear to endorse H.R. 7987, and yet a number of the places you indicate that States should contract with the private mints for producing their own commemorative bicentennial medals; perhaps a series of them. Don't you think that the 14 medals authorized by H.R. 7987 will almost saturate the market if they are all produced by the U.S. Mint?

Mr. CERULLO. Well sir, if that is the case, then I imagine we are all here on a fool's errand, because there have been a substantial number of bicentennial programs already promoted by private industry, and none of us really have any marketplace to talk about for 1976 as regards the bicentennial in this country.

There have been commemorative medal series struck and marketed as regards the bicentennial in this country. There have been commemorative medal series struck and marketed already on very large scales commemorative of 200 years of the history of the United States, a history of the Revolution itself.

There was a numismatic-philatelic series, "The Landmarks of America." Yesterday my esteemed competitor scooped the Bicentennial Commission on a PNC relative to the stamp designs. We have,

in concert with the National Rifle Association and with the Pilgrim people in Plymouth, marketed a series of commemorative medals with bicentennial tie-ins. I think my testimony states both explicitly and implicitly that the existence of a bicentennial medal program, both the single medal and the collector concept of a series, the existence of this emanating on a national level with the kind of publicity and the legitimacy and the dignity with which it will be carried to the American public will only enhance the marketplace.

Now, that is the view of my company.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To date you and the other private mints that have issued bicentennial commemorative medals have been operated without compensation from the U.S. Government and the ARBC. Now, if you have a series of 14 national commemorative medals for the bicentennial you don't believe, then, that it will saturate the market to the point where sales by the States of bicentennial commemorative medals produced for them by private mints will be affected?

Mr. CERULLO. No, I don't believe so. I believe exactly the opposite. I believe they will enhance the marketplace. I hope that the awareness on the part of the American public that a series of national statute exists will stimulate the collection of commemorative medals, either on the specific perspectives—for example: a firearms collector's view of America utilizing the idea of following the history of firearms. I believe that kind of marketplace has been stimulated. I believe that the 13 medal series that the U.S. Mint would be producing could only touch on the highlights of American history or American philosophy or constitutional thought, or whatever the theme would be.

Each State certainly has an incredible amount of heritage to operate with. The existence of an interest in that national series would create or would certainly stimulate the pride of the individual States and would stimulate the people living in those States to collect commemorative medal series, or single editions commemorative of their specific history; their specific perspective. All it is going to do is to make people want more medals, which is, in our view, good for the private minting field.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly hope your projections are right. I would like to call to your attention that there are a number of numismatics who have limited means, and even though they might like to buy a great number of sets, I rather question their financial ability to do so.

Mr. CERULLO. Recycled aluminum is very inexpensive, sir.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Cerullo. I think we are letting you out in time to catch your plane. Thanks very much for coming and waiting so patiently to be heard.

Mr. CERULLO. Thank you very much, ma'am. It was my pleasure.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Louth, I think you wrote to me about the Ohio Northern University medal last year and suggested that we look into the matter of competition by the mint with private enterprise, so we are extremely interested in your views on that point. I know that all three of the firms that you gentlemen represent do beautiful work, and of course we do want you to prosper.

We have a feeling that medals commemorating events of great national interest have a different connotation to the collector and to the public when struck by the mint as national medals. But we certainly have never intended—and our legislative history in the past 7



or 8 years shows we have never intended—to go hogwild, and we have not, in the matter of authorizing the striking of medals by the mint.

Will you summarize your statement, and then we will have Mr. Segel summarize his, and then we will question you together.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM T. LOUTH, PRESIDENT, MEDALLIC ART CO., NEW YORK, N.Y.**

Mr. LOUTH. Madam Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, you do have my printed statement, and I will summarize it in the interest of brevity.

I do want to make one point, or several points. I am distressed that there is any controversy at all, in regard to issuing this medal, because I feel it is clearly within the rights of this Commission and our country to issue a bicentennial medal.

I also want to strongly emphasize a point that I have touched on in my statement, the fact that the Bicentennial Commission has been eminently fair, as far as I am concerned. Ever since its establishment, we have been received courteously; they have been willing to talk with us; they have been willing to listen to ideas. I have been very impressed by the fact that before they even started they had an in-depth study done in which they talked to various manufacturers, numismatic experts, and others to find out what direction they should proceed in.

Then, further, as you are all aware, they formed this advisory panel of coins and medals. Certainly the names on that advisory panel are some of the most distinguished in the business, and I don't think anyone could be critical of that panel.

So, I think that they have done everything possible to consider what should be done in this field of medals and coins.

As I have emphasized, the Government has issued commemoratives on past occasions. I am in complete agreement that when there is a national occasion this should be done.

Going back to 1966 when I was privileged to speak before the American Numismatic Association I emphasized the importance of the bicentennial in regard to numismatics and medals in general. I feel very strongly and wish to emphasize the point that Mrs. Russell touched on, that whatever the Government does it should be of the highest quality and it should reflect the finest artistic talent that we bring to bear on this project.

I feel very strongly that we should do something in the way of our coins. There is no surer way to reach every man in this country than through the coins that pass through his hands. There are many examples of other countries—Canada, I believe, on the occasion of its centennial, issued a complete set of its coins. I feel that with the new facilities at the U.S. Mint that there is no reason why our coins cannot be changed.

I go further than some: I don't think it needs to be a commemorative coin. I would like to see the whole set done. I think this could be a very exciting thing for our country.

I feel that the design of our coins and medals can also receive a great emphasis from this activity, whatever this ARBC group decides to do.

As I pointed out in my statement, much of the art work that is being done this day, modern art and modern architecture, doesn't lend itself to what I call a traditional form of sculpture. I want to make a very strong plea that, because our coins and medals by and large represent a traditional form of sculpture, they tell a story, that this is an exciting opportunity to call upon the artists of our country, the talented sculptors, to create new coins, new medals, and to support these distinguished sculptors.

So, I feel that great emphasis must be given to the artistic aspect of this program.

Another thing that I wanted to just briefly touch on is that there are many different ways that this medal or these medals can be distributed. The mint list is available to the ARBC. Certainly this is a tremendous list of people whom we know are interested in this sort of thing, but I also want to say that the banking institutions of this country have been instrumental in a number of programs in helping to distribute them and it seems to me that this might be something that our banking organizations might very well want to take on.

Now, my recommendations several months ago when I was invited to appear before the ARBC committee, were slightly different from those that came out from the Commission, and as I have stated, I respect this Commission's recommendations, although I don't completely agree with them. My original recommendations were that there be a single national medal promoted and I think it will take several years to distribute this medal properly. I think there should be a different award medal. I see no reason why it should be of the same design. I think this gives us an opportunity, and why limit us to one design?

I think with the talented artists that we have there is no reason why a second medal can't be created which would be the exclusive property, so to speak, of the Government and the Congress of the United States, which could be used for special award purposes.

I also suggested, in addition to the national medal and the award medal, changes in our coinage. Now, I support this commission and I support this bill, if that is what they want to do, because I think it is clearly within their rights to do this if they so desire. I think there is a great deal of precedent for it.

I prepared my statement before I read the papers in regard to Mr. Segel's announcement of his medal and stamp combination. I disagree with some previous testimony that was given here as to whether or not that would affect their program. I think it will. I think it will be difficult for the general public to distinguish between the so-called "Government," and this issue that has been done. Since they have seen fit to take this action, I would honestly have to recommend that the ARBC would have to restudy their medal program. I would hope that the next time they come up with an idea they can go forward with it.

I didn't know that we were going to have this opportunity to talk in his general area of competition with the mint. But I am prepared to speak to this point. I think the mint has competed with private enterprise. I think there are some instances of medals that are issued where they have stretched a point considerably to call the particular medal a national medal.



Your medal for Dartmouth University, I don't see that that is a national medal. I am not even sure that the Golden Spike Celebration was an event deserving a national medal. I am not sure that many of the city and State anniversaries are appropriate subjects for national medals. This is how we make our living, making this kind of medal and we have done it very successfully for many, many States. We have done it for California and Illinois recently; for the city of San Juan, P.R., and at the present time we are working with the city of Indianapolis.

There is no reason why this type of celebration can't come to private mints.

So, my definition of a national medal is a very narrow one. It is one where the medal definitely has to relate to our Federal Government, and it has to definitely relate to a Federal historical act. In my opinion, I do not think that these medals should be made in large quantities for sale through private organizations, and I can give you an example: the Walt Disney Medal. Several hundred thousand were authorized for one of the colleges on the west coast to sell for fund-raising purposes. To me this gets away from the purpose of a national medal. So, I do think you have to be very careful in this regard.

I do think the mint has competed with us on occasion, although I respectfully agree with you, Madam Chairman, there certainly haven't been a plethora of these; they have been carefully controlled, and there haven't been many that particularly concerned me.

But I think the Ohio College one that you mentioned is getting outside of the range.

So, these are my comments, and I would again emphasize that there is a very exciting opportunity here for our country and our Government and our U.S. Mint to do something of significance and lasting importance on this occasion.

In regard to timing I want to mention this: There was some comment made that this celebration is 3 or 4 years away. I think they had better get with it and get with it quickly, because—we talk about the market being saturated; it is going to be saturated privately if the Government doesn't get in this themselves.

So, I think that they should move quickly.

Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Louth follows):

PREPARED STATEMENT OF WILLIAM T. LOUTH, PRESIDENT, MEDALLIC ART CO.,  
NEW YORK, N.Y.

My company is most privileged to have an opportunity to present to you our views in regard to the proposed legislation HR-7987.

First, may I compliment the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission for the way it has approached its study and its final recommendations in regard to the proposed medals.

Our company has been in touch with the Commission ever since its establishment. We have always been received most courteously and there has always been exhibited a desire to learn and to openly receive all suggestions that are presented for evaluation.

We were very much impressed that in May of 1970 they did an extensive survey and study, talking with all manufacturers, government agencies, numismatic experts, in order to learn everyone's viewpoint. Furthermore, the Commission held open hearings in September of 1970 to again give all interested parties an opportunity to express their views. They formed an advisory com-

mittee on medals and coins of distinguished numismatists and scholars. Although I may not personally agree with every recommendation that this committee has made, I respect the manner in which they arrived at their decisions and feel that they are eminently within their rights in making the recommendations that they did.

It should be stated at the outset that it is my belief that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was charged in the Joint Resolution (Public Law 89-491) adopted by Congress July 4, 1966, to prepare an overall program for commemorating the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, and specifically under Section 3—point 7—"the issuance of commemorative coins, medals, certificates of recognition, and stamps." The government has issued medals to commemorate important occasions, so it seems to me that on the basis of this Resolution that indeed a medal should be and can be an important part of this celebration.

May I digress for a moment. Medallie Art Company has consistently tried to place its own interests in a secondary position as to what is right for the Commission. Therefore this statement today is not really a Medallie Art Company official position, but is a statement of an experienced manufacturer presented as a guideline in the interest of being helpful. Most of you are familiar with the Medallie Art Company—we were established some 70 years ago, and have been recognized as the leader in the field of medallie art. We introduced the art of the medal as it is known today, to this country, and we are privileged to be custodians of most of the important awards from the Pulitzer Award to the National Medal of Science. It has been our privilege to cooperate with the Mint and various government agencies for many years.

#### FIRST ANNOUNCEMENT IN 1966

May I start by making reference to a 1966 speech that I gave before the American Numismatic Association Convention in Chicago? I believe I was one of the first to call attention to the important numismatic aspects of this event. At the time I was speaking, I made a number of announcements to the ANA group gathered there and I'm going to quote part of that speech starting with the second announcement:

With the new mint being built in Philadelphia, and with the new rapid equipment which will be installed there, I feel the ANA should press for a change in the law which permits a new type of coin design only every 25 years. Perhaps a proper interval would be 10 or 15 years. This certainly would revitalize and strengthen the time-honored hobby of coin collecting and would enable us to commemorate with greater frequency those events and personages of historical importance. But I want to make it clear that this is not my primary purpose in making this suggestion. My primary reason is the American sculptor who is forgetting how to design a coin. I have been talking about beauty and the need to appreciate the sculptor's art. By issuing new coins with greater frequency, and by returning to the old tradition of commissioning directly our great sculptors, or by holding closed competitions, we will support our sculptors and will, in a sense, create more engravers capable of doing this fine work for the Mint.

Sculptors who are able to create good medals and coin designs are becoming more scarce, for in modern architecture, and in modern art, the traditional form of sculpture is dying. Why shouldn't our government, why shouldn't we as numismatists, support these men by making such commissions available? We **must** put the artist back on the pedestal where he belongs.

My proposal is that the ANA should be instrumental in introducing legislation to have an official coin struck, or several coins struck, to commemorate the 1976 Bicentennial of American Independence. Even if our present laws were not changed, several of our current coins will have passed their 25th birthday. Certainly, this event should be commemorated in this way. The ANA should take the leadership in pushing for proper Congressional action.

The previous suggestions cannot be implemented by myself alone. However, my next proposal is one which does emphasize the sincere interest we have in promoting art medals. The Medallie Art Company is placing \$3,000 in escrow to be used as prize money in a nationwide competition to design a medal to commemorate this Bicentennial. It is hoped that this medal will be one of the finest ever produced in this country. The Medallie Art Company will welcome the participation of the American Numismatic Association, or any other group who feel that this is a worthwhile endeavor.



The reason that I quote from this speech is that I want to emphasize that we have constantly placed the importance on the artist and the historical significance of this event.

This Commission had a responsibility to recommend certain specific action and it did this. I do hope the program that is eventually developed will protect coins and medals from exploitation and over commercialization: will not stress investment value, but rather will stress historical value, in keeping with the dignity of the occasion. It is important that every man, woman and child have the right to buy a single medal or to obtain a single coin at a price he can afford. Although it makes a great deal of sense for the Commission to want to obtain maximum income and maximum distribution, I sincerely hope that we can still maintain the highest standards of fine art and to maintain the historical dignity these pieces so richly deserve. Already there have been a plethora of medals issued of significant historical value.

Our company has been instrumental in helping to design a series of medals to commemorate all of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence. There have been many other private manufacturers who have undertaken similar broad programs. However, it is my firm belief that to a country as great as ours, with our historical heritage, and with the great artistic talent available to us, there is certainly plenty of material available to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to create a meaningful, medallie program. There is no better way to reach the hand of every common man in this country than through the money that circulates in our coinage. It is for this reason that I do hope that the Congress will see fit to pass legislation for a commemorative coin or coins.

I am no expert in Treasury affairs, and I have no intention of saying what can and cannot be done. However, it does seem to me that with the new Mint and with the new technology, with enough lead time and planning, and with enough advanced production, it certainly would appear that at least a single commemorative coin could be possible.

I feel strongly that this commemorative coin should be a circulating coin, distributed through the Federal Reserve System. Equal distribution is thus assured and every man, woman and child will have an equal opportunity to obtain such a piece.

#### DESIGN

We come now to the area of design. To me this offers the greatest area of excitement. I would like to see the coin, the National Medal and the award medal developed by three separate competitions. In themselves, this would create the greatest excitement. It would create a great amount of publicity. It would rekindle interest of the art world in the form of the bas-relief medal. I think the avant-garde artist should be invited to participate as well as the traditional. There could be a combination of closed and open competition. For instance, in the coin competition, I would recommend a closed competition. This is a demanding art, one with great technical requirements and I think four or five sculptors who are familiar with the requirements should be invited to participate in this closed competition.

For the National Medal, I feel it should be an open competition, perhaps requesting the traditional artist particularly to enter this competition, for I do think the buying public would prefer a representational design.

For the award medal I would recommend an open competition, perhaps encouraging the contemporary or avant-garde sculptor to enter this particular competition.

Thus, as you can see, all art forms would be involved in these various pieces. You would have a combination of closed and open competition. I think you should get the advice and support of the Fine Arts Commission, the National Gallery of Art, and many of the other professional art organizations to advise you in this area.

#### TIMING

Now in regard to timing, I think the sooner this medal is issued and distributed, the better. It would take a great deal of time to develop the design of this medal and to build the necessary stocks for broad distribution. I feel that any medal will undoubtedly be produced for several years in order to meet the demand.

I feel the very numbers of people who would want such a piece requires this type of distribution. The Treasury would profit through its seigniorage, the Bicentennial Commission through those pieces made available to it for those who wish to pay a premium to be assured of obtaining such a piece, and the American public and the numismatist would also benefit, and each would have its own place in the distribution of these commemorative coins.

I will go no further. The extent of the Treasury cooperation will have to be worked out with them. This could be the most exciting aspect of this whole program. So much for the coins.

When appearing before the Bicentennial Commission it was my recommendation that an award medal be developed for the exclusive use of the Commission. I recommended that there be a low relief medal that would be struck for mass distribution on rapid equipment and a higher relief medal of larger diameter for those who wanted to have a special piece for display purposes. I also suggested that perhaps both of these medals be issued in bronze and silver. It seemed to me that a single medal properly produced and widely distributed would lend importance to this piece and would eliminate some of the confusion relative to having a series of medals.

#### DISTRIBUTION

Assuming that this program were adopted, how could medals be distributed? I believe through the same channels as our money, our banks, and our Treasury Department, and our numismatic sales division. This develops the greatest profit for the government and the Commission. Banks have been willing to do this as a public service in the states of Illinois and California, and we have no reason to believe that this would not be the case throughout our other 48 states.

If private distribution is required, there are literally hundreds of mail-order companies, sales promotion organizations, numismatic distributing companies, who could handle such an assignment, and would be willing to do so.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

It should be stated that Medallic Art Company has consistently opposed competition from the United States Mint with private enterprise, and I think with some justification, for I feel some of the so-called national medals have strayed considerably from the norm. The Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, a member of this committee, has indicated in a speech before the American Numismatic Association last year, that it is her desire to try to develop a more meaningful definition of a national medal. For I must admit that if there ever were justification for a national medal this celebration of the Bicentennial is it.

Therefore, I recommend that legislation be enacted to fulfill the recommendations of the Advisory Coin Medal Council and that further favorable action be taken to allow coinage to be changed to permit a suitable commemorative coin or coins to be issued. Private manufacturers have an ample opportunity to cooperate with the 50 states, patriotic, civic and commercial organizations throughout the country who will want to participate in some way in this celebration. The official medals prepared by the Mint will be consistently controlled and will maintain official government status. I would recommend that further consideration be given to preparing a large 2½" to 3" art medal to culminate this program and to give our country and collector and the ordinary citizen a true art medal suitable for display purposes. There is great historical precedence for this in many of the previous medals already issued. I further recommend that a distinctive award medal be prepared for the exclusive use of the Congress and the President of the United States.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our views to you. Medallic Art pledges its full cooperation to help in any way we can the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and the Congress of the United States.

Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Louth.

We will withhold questions until Mr. Segel has made his statement.  
Mr. Segel.



STATEMENT OF JOSEPH M. SEGEL, PRESIDENT, THE FRANKLIN  
MINT, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. SEGEL. Thank you, Madam Chairman and distinguished members of the committee. We have a somewhat different viewpoint, I think you recognize, and since we are more or less speaking alone here today in basic opposition to the bill, I would like to follow closely my prepared remarks, which will only take about 7 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. All right.

Mr. SEGEL. We have considered the possibility of modifying our previously stated position to go along with the impressive array of witnesses here today who are expected to testify in favor of the bill. But we cannot, in good conscience, support this proposed legislation. We have a different and legitimate business interest to be concerned with, quite different from the other representatives of private industry here today. We are not ashamed of that. We think there is nothing wrong with operating a business for profit in this country. It is profits that generate the substantial taxes that we pay to State, local, and Federal governments, and which provide the means to pay a payroll of a thousand people who, in turn, pay taxes. While we welcome fair and honest competition from the private sector of the country, we just do not look kindly toward increased Federal competition.

We believe that we speak today not only for ourselves, but for the millions of citizens who feel that we do that the Federal Government is already too large and powerful, and that no new Federal program should be embarked upon which would, instead, be handled by local, State, or private groups, and that the greatest patriotism is to valiantly resist the persistent erosion of the free enterprise system that built this Nation.

The medal program proposed by this legislation would place the ARBC in competition with established, taxpaying private industry.

In a summary of this proposed program to the full commission, the ARBC staff has explained:

It may in some ways reduce the market for private business by virtue of competition but should help develop the field of collecting and the consumer market overall.

I believe that any serious consideration of this program should have stopped right there.

We submit that it is not a proper purpose of the ARBC to reduce the market for private business.

Nor do we think it is appropriate for the ARBC to divert any of its attention or resources to develop the field of collecting and the consumer market overall. That is not what they were set up to do.

In addition to this proposed competition being undesirable and unnecessary, it would also be unfair competition. It is proposed that the medals be furnished by the U.S. Mint at cost. No less authority than the General Accounting Office has indicated that the accounting system employed by the Bureau of the Mint does not fully reflect all allocable costs, and I believe this is acknowledged by Treasury officials. Further-

more, a Federal agency or commission can secure many "free" services that create an even greater competitive advantage.

The commemorative medal business is essentially a commercial business. In the past, the commemorative medals produced by the U.S. Mint have not seriously affected the market, because such programs have been relatively small. This proposed ARBC program, however, is being planned on a completely unprecedented grandiose scale.

One of the things that disturbs us most about this situation is that the ARBC staff and their distinguished supporters have developed an evangelistic commitment to the program. Yet a careful study of the background behind these proposals, and of the extremely brief deliberations of the ARBC Coins and Medals Advisory Panel, indicates that the basic program of six to 13 medals was hastily presented and hastily approved.

In addition, there has been virtually no discussion as to what these medals will individually commemorate. As experienced medal merchandisers, we see potential trouble on the horizon. This could develop into the Vietnam of the medal industry. The Federal Government could pour unlimited funds and resources into an ill-conceived program to try to make it popular, while creating havoc in the marketplace.

It is very difficult to compete against the Federal Government. If the ARBC enters the medal market with a promotion of the scale that has been proposed, the private sector will be at its mercy.

The growth of the Federal bureaucracy has been largely due to a continuous stream of well-meaning proposals like this one, where people thought only in terms of what additional services the Federal Government might provide without fully considering the costs, risks, and eventual consequences. Many such programs, as you well know, were clothed with the same kind of "God and motherhood" appeals as what is before you today, but the end result in all too many cases is an increased cost to the economy, a further shifting of employment from private industry to the Government, and a further erosion of the free enterprise system.

Before any new Federal program is embarked upon, we believe that the proposers and supporters should bear the full burden of proof that the program is really necessary. That challenge has neither been accepted nor met in this case.

In fact, this program is obviously not necessary. Certainly there are a number of very distinguished numismatists lined up in favor of it. But there is no substantial body of collectors clamoring for commemorative medals sponsored by the Federal Government and minted by the U.S. Mint.

I venture to say that if you took a survey of the general public on this issue, you would find great apathy. If you took a survey of medal collectors, you would very likely find a strong preference for privately issued medals, because this is what they are now collecting. On the other hand, if you took a completely impartial survey of coin collectors, I believe you would find that most of them prefer to have a coin issue—and not a medal issue—produced by the U.S. Mint.

There have been a number of excellent proposals for issuing one or more new circulating coins in celebration of the American Bicenten-



nial. This is the kind of commemorative program which would be more clearly in the public interest and would insure the involvement of our entire population in Bicentennial commemoration. The Bicentennial message would then, literally, be at the fingertips of every man, woman, and child in the country. You could change all the coin designs for the Bicentennial, or at least one denomination, to create a distinctive commemorative of this great historic event.

If the proposed medal legislation is not passed, there will be no shortage of commemorative medals issued in celebration of the American Bicentennial. The Franklin Mint itself has been deeply involved in bicentennial commemoration since 1968. We have recently completed a series of 50 medals commemorating, in great depth, the history of the American Revolution. A special edition of this series is currently being offered as the first official series of commemorative medals of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In addition, we are well along the way in producing a series of 200 medals commemorating every year in the history of the United States from 1776 to 1976.

We are also producing a series of 50 medals for the National Trust commemorating America's great historic sites. Further, we are producing a series of medals honoring 12 great Americans each year, in conjunction with the gallery of the great Americans which will be fully established by 1976.

It is significant to note that the Franklin Mint has already invested more than \$1,500,000 in the preparation and promotion of these bicentennial-related programs. There is probably no other business organization that is as committed to the bicentennial or has publicized it as thoroughly as we have.

In addition to all the bicentennial-related medals we are producing—many of which are the official issues of States and local groups—there are a number of other medal producers who are also involved in various bicentennial commemorative programs.

Encouraging private enterprise and localized private and public organizations to do all they wish to commemorate the American Revolution, without Federal competition or interference, is in the finest tradition of the true spirit of American freedom—and that is our most solemn recommendation.

A coin of the realm program would be complementary to the medal programs of State, local, and private groups—and that is what we strongly urge you to redirect your attention to. Such a program would have wide support and would most effectively reaffirm the principles for which the American Revolution was fought two centuries ago.

We thank you most sincerely for the time you have given us today. We stand ready to answer any questions.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Louth, as I said in my opening statement this morning, we have been rather openhanded in the past in authorizing commemorative medals for States and cities, and so on. But we have agreed on the need for more stringent guidelines.

We authorized medals in the past 8 years in order to blunt the drive for privately sold commemorative coins, as I mentioned this morning. But I think we could serve collectors by encouraging more special issues of circulating coins. I think you agree with that, but the Treasury has been opposed to it.

Mr. Segel, one thing I want to ask you, and this is the thing that hit me when we saw the ad yesterday, the words "Official Medallie First Day Issue." Now, don't you feel that this is going to give the average person the wrong impression of what the "official" medal means?

Mr. SEGEL. No. I do not agree with that. We have issued many official medals for many organizations: Governmental authorities and Government-affiliated organizations. The word "official" has come to mean, in a generic sense, either an official issue of a particular organization or the official issue of the Government. It is not a word that is restricted for the exclusive use of the Federal Government.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But we are celebrating the 200th anniversary of our own country, and so an official medal could certainly, if anything else in this world is, be of national interest. When you name yours "official" without being authorized by a commission or some national body, I think you are assuming that you and no other private mint, and there are other private mints beside the ones that Mr. Louth and Mr. Cerullo represent, would be the national company to do this-- the official company.

Mr. SEGEL. That ad doesn't offer a single issue. It appears to have been somewhat misinterpreted. That ad offers a series of medallie first day covers which will be issued by "The Postmasters of America," an organization established by the two associations that together represent virtually all of the 31,000 postmasters of the United States. That is the National Association of Postmasters of the United States and National League of Postmasters. Together they formed, about a month ago, the Joint Postal Commemorative Committee to issue a special issue commemorating the changeover from the Post Office Department to the U.S. Postal Service.

Following the success of this issue, they decided that they wanted to start producing a series of medals, and it was completely unrelated, despite the suggestion to the contrary, to the bicentennial medal question. They decided they wanted to produce a series of medals in conjunction with the commemorative stamps issued by the new U.S. Postal Service. The ad clearly states that this is the first of such a series of medals. The fact that the first commemorative stamp issued by the new U.S. Postal Service commemorates the American Bicentennial is really pure coincidence.

I must admit that I felt a little uncomfortable about it, that it happened that the very first commemorative stamp to be issued by the new U.S. Postal Service, happens to be a stamp commemorating the American Revolution. We did not desire that. We would have been much happier if that were not the first commemorative stamp to have been issued by the U.S. Postal Service.

But, this series of medallie first day covers will be issued concurrently with all of the commemorative stamps to be issued by the U.S. Postal Service. This is the same type of program that we introduced last year for the United Nations Association of the United States, and which has since been officially adopted by the United Nations itself.

And I have to refute Mr. Louth's suggestion that this is exclusively ARBC territory. It is not. We have a precedent for producing this type of program in conjunction with the official commemorative stamps issued by the United Nations. Now we are producing essentially the same



type of program in conjunction with the commemorative stamps issued by the new U.S. Postal Service, involving medals in official first day covers.

I use the term "official first day covers" advisedly, because that really threw us for a while. When we saw another organization advertising a first day cover series and calling them "official U.S. first day covers," we checked with the Post Office Department, because we thought that such a combination of "official U.S." first day covers was going too far for a program that was promoted by a private organization. The Post Office Department advised us that this was the correct terminology for any first day cover that is officially postmarked on the first day of issue of the stamp by the officially designated post office of first issue. Such first day covers have been widely advertised as "official U.S. first day covers."

However, we left off the "U.S." because we felt that was going too far. But there should be no question about the fact that the cancellation of these envelopes on the first day of issue makes them official first-day covers. Furthermore, the program in question involves official medallion first day covers issued by Postmasters of America, an organization established by the two associations that together represent virtually all of the 31,000 postmasters of the United States. The word "official" has broad use, and this is certainly within its accustomed usage.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Well, I feel that you must have had a very clever person write up your ad to get this term "Official Medal" in here when the Bicentennial Commission has been set up to issue certain mementos of the 200th anniversary of the Nation. And I think this just hit us to the point where many of us felt this was misleading the people.

Mr. SEGEL, first of all, I want to apologize for the staff in misspelling your name on the place card. I know how it feels. They don't misspell Sullivan, but they certainly misspell my first name in every way it can be spelled.

In any event, I want to congratulate you on the forthright, vigorous manner in which you have presented your viewpoint.

It is our information that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission had intended to put out its first commemorative medal coincident with the new bicentennial stamp on July 4 of this year but that your objections held up the bill in the Office of Management and Budget until it was too late to be passed in time for such a medal this year. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. SEGEL. I believe that our objections and those of the States certainly did contribute to delaying consideration of the bill by this committee.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Segel, how many medals does Franklin Mint make and sell a year?

Mr. SEGEL. In dollar amount last year our total sales were approximately \$45 million, and I believe that more than \$40 million of the \$45 million can be classified as commemorative medals.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Do you think there is a limited market, or is there a constantly growing market for medals?

Mr. SEGEL. The market is definitely growing as far as we can see it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Don't you think that the estimate in the millions for the sale of the bicentennial medals are very much over the market, much too optimistic?

Mr. SEGEL. Yes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Did you have any idea for a combination of bi-centennial medal and stamp, such as you announced on Sunday, before or after the bicentennial group proposed it? In other words, did you take their idea, or did they take yours?

Mr. SEGEL. Well, that is a very interesting question. I am glad you asked, because it gives me an opportunity to clarify a few things.

We certainly have issued combination stamp-medal covers, or PNCs as they are called, before the 6- to 13-medal program was proposed to the Coins and Medals Advisory Panel in executive session. We did not find out about this proposal until about 2 months later, when it was leaked out of the press; it was kept secret for about 2 months.

I don't remember the first date that we issued a PNC, a combination stamp-medal first day cover, but I am certain it was well in advance of any public announcement of the ARBC's proposed program, and probably well in advance of any consideration by the ARBC.

In our testimony before the Coins and Medals Advisory Panel, which was the day before they apparently considered and adopted this PNC program, we mentioned the fact that we were about to introduce the series of medals commemorating great historic sites for the National Trust, and that is a PNC program.

So, there is a possibility that our activities in this field may have influenced them to some extent. But their ideas in this field are nothing original, whatsoever. The testimony by George Lang in regard to an alleged patent on the PNC concept is woefully misleading and most unfortunate. The same impression was given to the Coins and Medals Advisory Panel, and again to this committee, that one company owned a special patent on the combination of a stamp and medal with a first day cover.

I think that an examination of the transcript of the executive session of the Coins and Medals Advisory Panel would indicate that that misleading statement obviously influenced the panel to some extent. Our competitor, who was given privileged treatment, owns a patent on one particular type of envelope construction. They do not own a patent—no one owns a patent—on the combination of a stamp and a medal with a first day cover, despite the misleading statement to the contrary.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. You answered my criticism of using the word "Official" in this ad. But I wonder, in looking over your transcript for correction, if you would be a little more explicit in telling us what makes your medal-stamp combination official as it appears in the ad.

Mr. SEGEL. Yes; I will be glad to do that.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Because that is my big criticism of it. I think it deliberately misleads the public. If I am wrong I would like to have your correction.

Mr. SEGEL. It does not deliberately mislead the public, and we hope it does not accidentally mislead the public.

(In response to the request of Mrs. Sullivan, the following information was submitted for the record by Mr. Segel:)



## REPLY RECEIVED FROM MR. SEGEL

## DEFINITION AND USES OF THE WORD "OFFICIAL"

1. *Comments by Gerald C. Dragonetti, General Counsel of The Franklin Mint.*—The word "official" is commonly used in both a governmental and in a non-governmental or commercial sense. The widely accepted commercial and non-governmental usage of this word is made clear by reference to dictionaries and encyclopediae. Further, even in the technical legal sense, the word "official" is understood to apply also to commercial and non-governmental persons, things or events.

That which is "official" is "derived from the proper office or officer or authority: made or communicated by virtue of authority: Authorized. Authoritative". An official, "a person authorized to act for a government, corporation, organization or for another person . . ." (*Webster's 3rd New International Dictionary*, Page 1567).

The "official opening" of a store is illustrative of an "official" activity or event. (*The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, Page 1000).

In enacting Workmen's Compensation statutes, state legislatures have used the word "official" to exclude from coverage a large group of persons employed by private corporations in "official positions", such as corporate officers or plant managers. (*Danico v. Davenport Chamber of Commerce* 5 NW 2d 619.)

The Courts, in applying rules of evidence, recognize that a private corporation has "official records" (*Dewar v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.* 49 N.Y.S. 2d 404.) It has been acknowledged that businesses may charge an "official price". (6TCJS p. 486, footnote 12)

In the *Application of Meyer and Wenthe, Inc.* 267 2d 945, the Court indicated that the word "official" as used by the business litigant "relates to authenticity of an impression or configurations of an authentic design".

In *Wyatt Earp Enterprises, Inc. v. Sackman, Inc.* 157 F. Supp. 621, the proprietor of a television series brought an action to enjoin the manufacturer of "western" play clothes for making its products with the words "Wyatt Earp" and "official outfit". There the Court found that the notion of sponsorship by a private concern was indeed implied in the use of the word "official".

It is of note that the words "public official" are commonly used to refer to a person employed by the government. It is unlikely that the modifier "public" would persist in common usage unless it were necessary in order to make it clear that the official was affiliated with the government.

In conclusion, it is clear that reference to the term "official" in connection with a product, event or person may properly be construed as being descriptive of a relationship with a private person, firm or organization; and, accordingly, there is no reasonable basis for the proposition that such term solely imports government affiliation.

2. *Joint Statement by Edward V. Dorsey, Executive Director, National Association of Postmasters of the U.S. and Oliver Corona, Executive Director, National League of Postmasters.*—"We understand that a question has now been raised as to whether it is proper to use the word "official" in the identification of our medals and first day covers. In answer to this, we wish to advise that the word "official" has been traditionally used to identify any first day cover that has been officially postmarked on the first day of issue of the stamp contained thereon. Furthermore, both the medals and first day covers are official issues of our jointly established organization, Postmasters of America. The use of the word "official" in either of these contexts is both traditional and appropriate."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I certainly want to thank Mr. Louth and Mr. Segel for being here.

Mr. Louth, you opened your statement with some defense of the ARBC and the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals. This morning I questioned Mr. Lang's statement where he pointed out that the reason that no panel members were in the business of producing, dis-

tributing or selling commemorative pins or medals was the result of a considered policy decision of the commission.

I have spoken to some commission members, and they have no knowledge of this being a considered policy decision of the commission.

I also questioned the statement, "Following months of deliberation the panel submitted its recommendation to the full commission." I questioned that statement and I have asked for classification of this for the record. When I get it—if I am wrong, I will be happy to say so, but until I get this I actually have questions of procedure followed by the panel. I question the statement made by Mr. Lang concerning the policy of the commission.

Basically, you and Mr. Segel seem to be in agreement on the fact that the U.S. Mint should not engage in great competition with private mints in the field of commemorative medals.

I certainly have no issue to take with you on your statement that the U.S. Mint should produce the national commemorative medal for the Bicentennial. It is when we get into an additional series of 13 that I start to raise some questions.

On page two, quoting from your speech that you made in 1966, you refer to the new rapid equipment to be installed in the Philadelphia Mint. I did mention this morning that that equipment didn't work.

Mr. LOUTH. That isn't the rapid equipment I was referring to. That was an experimental machine. They have very rapid equipment that isn't the coin control.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the building of the new Philadelphia Mint was designed to accommodate the coin roller?

Mr. LOUTH. I am not an expert. I question that respectfully, sir. They had one room downstairs where the coin roller was, and to the best of my knowledge, most of their presses set up upstairs were set in position, and using the standard equipment that they used for years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the building was built to eventually accommodate the coin roller?

Mr. LOUTH. You may have more knowledge than I in this area.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, what they are trying to do now is fit machinery into the already predesigned building for the coin roller.

You make the statement also that the American sculptors are forgetting how to design a coin or medal. Don't you employ some highly qualified artists and sculptors to do this kind of work?

Mr. LOUTH. During the course of a year we will commission 50 or 60 different sculptors.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So, actually the American artists or the sculptors are not losing their ability to design coins and medals?

Mr. LOUTH. I would say that Mr. Segel has made a contribution in this area, as we have, and all I am stressing is the importance of bringing this kind of interest over into our own governmental Engraving and Treasury departments. They have a staff of competent artists at the mint. My emphasis here in this speech was that the Washington quarter, with which you are familiar, was designed by means of an open competition in which sculptors outside the mint did this work.

I strongly support this use of outside sculptors; not that I don't



think the present artists at the mint are incapable, but I am looking for as broad a cross section as possible and getting the best ideas that you can.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think you are to be complimented on the fact that you offered to put up \$3,000 to stimulate competition.

But, your company is set up, is it not, to produce medals called for in H.R. 7987?

Mr. LOUTH. Yes; I would say that we would be in a position to do this.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course I agree with your ideas and I think Mrs. Sullivan made the same point—that we are going rather far afield in producing medals for colleges and calling them national medals. I think you objected to that on a prior occasion.

What you are actually saying, Mr. Segel, is that you are producing first-day covers with stamps and commemorative medals for the postmasters of the United States?

Mr. SEGEL. The organization is known as the Postmasters of America. This is a new organization that was formed by the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, and the National League of Postmasters acting jointly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They have actually commissioned you to put out this series for them?

Mr. SEGEL. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So that as far as the word official is concerned, this is that organization's official commemorative medal series?

Mr. SEGEL. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. While I haven't had the chance to examine the ad carefully, apparently nowhere do you say that this is the official commemorative series for the United States?

Mr. SEGEL. I certainly hope we can say it in there. As a matter of fact, I think there is at the bottom of the copy there, a small paragraph that says very specifically what it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You mean, Postmasters of America is an organization established by the National League of Postmasters and the National Association of Postmasters of the United States specifically to provide a medallie first-day cover service.

That is what you are referring to?

Mr. SEGEL. Does it say something further beyond that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The commemorative medal will be the private issue of the Postmasters of America, and will be minted by the Franklin Mint, the world's foremost private mint, not affiliated with the U.S. Mint or any other governmental agency.

Mr. SEGEL. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, incidentally, you were talking about the fact that Mr. John Baker had a patent, and the inference was made that this patent would be on issuing a commemorative medal and a stamp together. It is my understand that the patent which Mr. John Baker had was simply in the manner in which he made and sealed the envelope. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. SEGEL. I believe that is the case; yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very fine.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Hanley.

Mr. HANLEY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Segel, as I interpret the tone of your testimony, it seems to deal clearly with the economics of the situation. I don't believe it was the intent of the ARBC and certainly not the intent of this committee to undermine American private enterprise. If I correctly interpret what you are attempting to effect here, it is to cloud the dignity associated with the manufacture of this commemorative medal. Those who have given the matter a great deal of time, effort, and study seem to be of the opinion that the best manner in which it should be accomplished is through its manufacture by the U.S. Mint. In that way we are assuring the general public that we have the quality and sort of medal that they want to purchase.

So, we are dealing really with a competitor relationship here. In years to come I believe the public may reflect back and say, "Was this medal really the genuine item or was it not?" I think the intent, again of the Commission and this committee, is to assure the American public that what they got on this occasion was the real thing. We are not at all interested in or desirous of undermining the American private enterprise system.

I was greatly interested when I read that ad a day or two ago in association with the commemorative medal to be issued in connection with July 1, the inauguration date of the new U.S. Postal Service.

May I close my inquiry by asking: what authority, other than the two sponsoring groups does the Franklin Mint have. For instance, did this matter have the approval of the Postmaster General?

Mr. SEGEL. Yes; it did have.

Mr. HANLEY. Now, both the National Association of Postmasters and the National League of Postmasters, I assume, continue to be separate and distinct organization: is that correct?

Mr. SEGEL. That is my understanding.

Mr. HANLEY. They united solely for the purpose of sponsoring this commemorative medal: is that correct?

Mr. SEGEL. They have not united; they remain separate organizations. They have formed a third organization for the purpose of issuing commemorative medals. I believe that they have also appointed a study organization to consider the possibility of a future possible merger. I have that information secondhand, because I have not personally been dealing with these two associations, and I have not been handling this program.

Mr. HANLEY. Is it accurate to say that they united for the purpose of sponsoring this commemorative medal?

Mr. SEGEL. First, for the purpose of sponsoring the issue that commemorated the changeover to the new U.S. Postal Service on July 1, and then subsequently for the purpose of issuing a series of medals, beginning with the first commemorative stamp issued by the new U.S. Postal Service; two separate efforts.

Mr. HANLEY. May I ask: Will any benefit, financial or otherwise, accrue to the associations or association that we have referred to?

Mr. SEGEL. Certainly.

Mr. HANLEY. Will you expand on that, please?

Mr. SEGEL. I don't have the details with me, but these programs are definitely to the financial benefit of both associations.



Mr. HANLEY. This is what troubled me so greatly. I refer to the dignity of the occasion and actually you are a commercial enterprise; not in business as a public service, but to enjoy a profit and satisfy the stockholders of your company.

In the same fashion, really, the people of America can be misled by the advertising that we have referred to. Certain interests are going to enjoy a profit as a result of this undertaking. It is a promotion, and it isn't officially sanctioned by the U.S. Government as the language of your advertising would imply.

So, I relate that advertising to this testimony, and your interest in the legislation pending in this subcommittee. I make the further observation that I find myself in total disagreement with your testimony. I find myself in agreement with the efforts of the ARBC. As I see it, I think it regrettable that people could be misled if the coins are not struck by the U.S. Mint.

I have no further questions, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Mrs. Heckler.

Mrs. HECKLER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

There seems to be a difference among the witnesses from the private enterprise sector on the influence of H.R. 7987 on private enterprise. Mr. Cerullo and Mr. Louth both support this bill, as I understand it.

I would like to have you state, Mr. Louth, your attitude toward the passage of this bill, vis-a-vis the effect upon the private enterprise sector of the medal-producing area of the economy.

In other words, there is a difference as to whether or not that the striking of these medals by the mint dampens or enhances the general desire of consumers for medals and the opportunity for profit of the private enterprise sector.

Mr. LOUTH. I think the difference here is perhaps one of philosophy. No one can speak with great assurance that it will or it won't. In my notes I indicated that I tried to put our private interest to some degree behind me.

Mr. Segel states that he is in business to make a profit, and so am I. But, I also have an obligation to my country and I think there are times when the country has a right to do certain things. I think if you carry this theory forward that the Government doesn't do anything to compete with private enterprise, the ARBC couldn't issue a book or imprinted document of any kind because there are private companies that can do this.

But I think the point that I want to make is that our Government has the right, in my opinion, to issue a medal to commemorate this country. Now, there is a great historical precedence for it, not only in this country, but throughout the world.

I would also take issue with the statement that the public doesn't care whether it is made at the mint. I think I make a better quality product than the mint, and I told them so. But at the same time I think I have the right to do this, so therefore I am willing to put behind me to some degree the influence this might have upon the profit of my company in the interest of the good of our country and this important celebration.

To answer your question as honestly as I can: I think it will stimulate the collecting market. If the entire series of 11 medals were done,

I think it would have a tendency to saturate to some degree and perhaps to kill some interest. People might become confused, there are so many of these things coming out. I think a series of six or seven tied in with the stamp, which was their original idea, was an interesting idea and I think it was their idea to raise some immediate funds, which speaks to Mr. McKinney's point, as he would like to see this Commission support itself to some degree. I think they have that right, also.

The national medal, what I call the national medal, and the one that I keep coming back to, is the one they should promote. So, it is a difficult question. I think it can be overdone. As I said, I am not in complete agreement with the Commission's ideas in this regard, and I wasn't defending the Commission; I was merely supporting it.

Mrs. HECKLER. You are in favor of the national medal and the 13 other medals and do you feel that they should be of similar size, and so forth, on the theory of Mr. McKinney, that the stimulation to a collector would be a great motivation?

Mr. LOUTH. I think they should be the same size. Coming back to the State programs, I think the States will go forward with their own programs, and they will perhaps have some degree of uniformity. That will be up to them to decide.

Of course, it was never my understanding—the ARBC would have to correct me—that they necessarily would issue all of these medals. It was my understanding that they were going to issue six or seven, but they have the authority for more.

Mrs. HECKLER. I would also like to know whether or not you would comment on whether you produce medals or coins for other nations, either one of you gentlemen. Do you do that?

Mr. LOUTH. In my company I do not.

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Segel.

Mr. SEGEL. We do.

Mrs. HECKLER. Would either of you care to comment on the policies of other nations with respect to the issuance of commemorative coins? Is there a wide variance in policy?

Mr. SEGEL. I am not sure I understand what you mean by "policy."

Mrs. HECKLER. In terms of the frequency of their issue of commemorative coins.

Mr. SEGEL. The smaller nations tend to issue commemorative coins much more frequently than the larger nations. There are many nations that issue commemorative coins for varied purposes. I am not sure I know what the measure of each of these purposes is in comparison to the whole. But I do know what one of the motivations is to call attention to the event, and another motivation is to make money for the treasury of the country.

We make both coins and medals. But medals are our basic business. The marketing of medals is our very basic business and in that respect our company is quite different from Mr. Louth's company. His company, I believe, makes medals on a contract basis and doesn't market them. We are basically marketers of medals as well as minters of medals. In addition to that we are minters and marketers of coins for foreign countries. We think that there is a much greater acceptance level of coins and medals, particularly for a notable event such as the 200th birthday of American independence, and that there will be a far



greater interest on the part of the public in this country or in any country under similar circumstances for one or more coins commemorating this event than one or more medals.

It is a struggle to market those on any subject, no matter how important it is. The coins don't even have to be marketed very aggressively; they sell themselves, because they have a face value, an exchange value that underlies them.

Mrs. HECKLER. Would you care to tell the committee what countries you have made coins for?

Mr. SEGEL. We have made coins for Tunisia, Panama, the Bahamas and Jamaica, and we have recently signed a contract to produce coins for Trinidad and Tobago.

Mrs. HECKLER. I think it is interesting to note, and the record should show, that the U.S. Government also make a profit on the printing, and we have figures to substantiate that. So, the profit is really not all on the side of the private sector.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Segel, Mr. Hanley had to leave. He asked me to ask for him if you would provide the committee, when you receive your transcript, the terms negotiated with the postmaster's associations on this particular issue.

Mr. SEGEL. I believe I can do that; I am not certain.

(The information requested follows:)

**SUMMARY OF ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN THE FRANKLIN MINT AND POSTMASTERS OF AMERICA RELATIVE TO MEDALLIC FIRST DAY COVER PROGRAM**

Postmasters of America, an organization established by the National League of Postmasters and the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, has embarked upon a program to issue a new commemorative medal and medallion first day cover every time a new commemorative stamp is issued by the U.S. Postal Service.

The total responsibility for designing, producing and marketing this program has been undertaken by The Franklin Mint.

The Franklin Mint has agreed to expend at least \$100,000 in advertising the program, to absorb all costs and to guarantee Postmasters of America both a minimum royalty and a fixed percentage of the receipts, whether the program is profitable or not.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I just wanted to say, especially to Mr. Louth, that this committee has really worked hard at times to discourage members from seeking legislation to strike national medals for organizations, educational institutions, and so forth where the national interest is limited. But the Members of Congress who introduce such legislation nevertheless ask us to approve it, because it is hard for them to say "no" to their constituents. This is why we asked the Treasury to give us its suggestions for reasonable guidelines, and to stand behind them as they did when they have said to us: "We will not entertain or support legislation for commemorative coins."

That helped Congress to put a stop to the flood of commemorative coins which were not coins to be circulated; but were coins to be sold at a profit by certain groups.

Mr. LOUTH. I understand that.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We haven't authorized any of those since the 30's, I believe, and certainly not since I have been in Congress.

Mr. LOTTIE. I understand that in your remarks this morning you said that Mrs. Brooks would incorporate that kind of definition. Did she?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. She has to an extent. We want to be sure that it is as tight as we can make it.

Mr. LOUTH. May I have a copy of that?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes; I will see that it is printed in the record.

I think there is agreement that the event should be of national significance, and we shall set up reasonable guidelines as to what is national, because we should have the mint in competition with private enterprise where it is not a matter of national significance.

Mr. LOTTIE. Please understand; I appreciate what you are trying to do.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Really we have only approved some 30 bills in all these 8 years now, so I don't think we have gone overboard with this.

Mr. Segel, lest anyone think that my questions may have been hostile to your company, I think that we can acknowledge that I sold about 200 of these for you—these congressional medallions which I have on my wrist. They are not cheap. When we put our heads together and said that we wanted a special congressional medallion my first idea was that it would be for the women members, but the men got the idea that it would be a pretty thing to give to their wives, so we arranged to get them for the entire U.S. Congress, any member who wishes to buy one, and we have come up with this 18 carat gold, and we are very happy with it.

But as legislators on this bill we have to know some of the things I have questioned you about. We understand, as Mr. Hanley said, that you are in a private business.

Mrs. HECKLER. Would the gentlewoman yield for just a moment?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, Mrs. Heckler?

Mrs. HECKLER. I would like to say that since the suggestion was made by a witness that certainly constitutional changes should be celebrated by the striking of a medal, and they should be of enduring nature and so forth, I immediately thought that one of the greatest opportunities for either the U.S. mint or the private enterprise will be the day when the equal rights for women amendment passes. I, for one, would subscribe to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would you yield to me for just a moment, Madam Chairman?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to say to Mr. Segel that this morning I put something about the history of the Franklin Mint in the record of these hearings today. I know you just returned from Europe sometime over this weekend. I do want to express my appreciation to you for appearing here today with your very informative statement.

As I stated this morning, the Franklin Mint started in my congressional district and when you started the Franklin Mint I think you employed 8 or 10 people. I think that was approximately 6 or 7 years ago. The Franklin Mint has grown so large that you are now employing over a thousand people. I believe your gross sales will exceed \$50 million this year. I think your company is a tribute to what can be accomplished under our American free enterprise system.



The only regret I have is that you have grown so large that you had to build a new building and move out of my district.

I do think it is unfortunate that Mr. Hanley had to leave and he couldn't be present at the hearing this morning, because if he had been he would have heard the comments made by Mr. Krause, the publisher of Numismatic News, on the amount of money that the U.S. Government gets from its coinage. I will read just from page 3 of his statement—we are talking about the U.S. Government coins:

An illustration of the seigniorage potential may be realized by studying the current fiscal year's 8.7 billion coin production, the face value of which is \$391,160,000, against a total cost of only \$13,896,000, leaving seigniorage profits of \$377,264,000 to the U.S. Government.

I also want to state that I do not believe that your ad is misleading at all to anybody who reads it. I think that this brochure, which I believe was made available to all the members of this subcommittee, illustrates the type of work that you are doing, which is really benefiting others than the Franklin Mint.

For instance, this brochure carries the seal of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Then actually pictured here is a series of 50 official commemorative medals sponsored by the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission.

Now, I know that half of the money that is produced by this project goes to the Pennsylvania Bicentennial Commission. This is how they will defray much of their expenses.

So, this is exactly what the people from the State bicentennial council were saying to us this morning. This is one of the ways that they can raise money to promote the celebration of the bicentennials in their States, and they should not have to buck Federal competition.

Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Any questions, Mr. Wylie?

Mr. WYLIE. I heard it stated this morning that several companies, including one in New Zealand, are already manufacturing those bicentennial medals. I was amazed that there was this widespread interest in the sale and collection of those medals. I guess there is a great deal of interest in the manufacture and sale of medals. Would there be a market for any bicentennial medals manufactured by New Zealand?

Mr. SEGEL. I think, if I may answer that, that there is a misunderstanding there. The comment that was made this morning by someone referring to the fact that philatelic-numismatic combination, the PNC concept that is a stamp and medal together with a first day cover, had been issued as far away as New Zealand. I don't remember who made it, but I think that is what we are referring to, rather than the fact that any bicentennial medal is being sold in New Zealand. It was the combination of the stamp and medal on a first-day cover, which is being used by many organizations in many series now, and has been for a number of years.

Mr. WYLIE. Thank you.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. There are collectors all over the world, though. I was telling Mr. Wylie, I didn't know much about this up until 8 years ago, but I have learned an awful lot on this committee and subcommittee as to the number of collectors, and their intense interest in numismatics, as well as the many dealers in coins and medals, and so

forth. Some of the commemorative half dollars issued in the thirties as I mentioned this morning, are selling for \$200 to \$300 for a 50-cent piece.

I want to advise all of the witnesses that their prepared statements will be printed in full in the record following the oral presentation of each witness.

I also want to include in the record a letter submitted to me this morning by the American Mining Congress, and have it printed at this point in the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS.  
June 29, 1971.

Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: The American Mining Congress is a national trade association composed of U.S. companies that produce most of the nation's metals, coal, and industrial and agricultural minerals. The American Mining Congress Silver Committee, which represents the U.S. silver-producing industry, has carefully reviewed H.R. 7987 and H.R. 9408, legislation being considered by your Committee. We would appreciate it if this letter reflecting the views of the American Mining Congress would be included in the hearing record.

H.R. 7987 is a measure recommended by the American Revolution Commission which would provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. H.R. 9408, introduced by Congressman McClure of Idaho, is similar in purpose but, in addition to providing for the striking of commemorative medals, it would also authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a silver dollar commemorative coin.

The Mining Congress fully supports the intent of the legislation now before you. However, we feel that the Congress should specifically stipulate that the precious metal in these commemorative medals should be silver. H.R. 7987 would leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to select the metallic content of these medals. However, the section-by-section explanation accompanying the bill states that "the national medal will be sold in both common and precious metals and large and small sizes, ranging, for example, from a small  $1\frac{5}{16}$  inch bronze to a 3 inch platinum medal."

Surprisingly, there is no mention made of silver. Yet silver is intimately associated with the history of the American Republic. In 1792 Congress enacted the Coinage Act which called for a bimetallic monetary standard with the dollar defined as equivalent in value to 371.25 grains of fine silver or 24.75 grains of fine gold. A mint was established in Philadelphia which provided for the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver. Silver is still in use in our coinage today. Thus, for all but 16 years of this nation's history silver has officially been a part of our coinage system. It would be historically inconsistent and hardly in keeping with the dignity of the occasion to celebrate this nation's 200th anniversary by failing to utilize silver in commemorative medals.

The suggestion made by the Bicentennial Commission that platinum be utilized is patently unsound. This nation must import virtually all of its platinum from abroad and the principal world producers of platinum are the Soviet Union, the Republic of South Africa, and Canada. The current price of platinum is in the range of \$120 to \$125 per troy ounce in contrast to a silver price of around \$1.60 per troy ounce.

We are also concerned over the amount of medals contemplated for production. Section 3 of H.R. 7987 states that "the Secretary shall strike and furnish to the Commission such quantities of medals as may be necessary, with a minimum order of 2,000 medals of each design or size. They shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission, but no medals may be made after December 31, 1983." The background explanation accompanying this bill states that "generally, medal production will be based on estimates of demand." In our judgment a minimum order of 2,000 medals is far too low and indicates a conservative outlook as to the popularity of such commemorative medals. If these medals are struck in a precious metal, particularly silver, there is every indication that the demand will be far in excess of the production apparently contemplated by the Commission.



There is an erroneous assumption that a non-silver medal is essentially as attractive as a silver medal and, because it is somewhat less in cost, it will attract many more buyers. Actually, there is a special preference that exists for silver among those who regard such a medal as a worthwhile keepsake which may be passed along to children and grandchildren. Such individuals represent a large proportion of potential buyers.

The Mining Congress feels that Congressman McClure's bill, H.R. 9408, is a far more reasonable approach to the problem than the measure sponsored by the Bicentennial Commission. We strongly support the provision of H.R. 9408 which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue a commemorative dollar coin in a clad material containing 40 percent silver in view of silver's role in the history of our nation. Such a commemorative coin would be fully in keeping with the Bicentennial celebration. It would also create significant revenue for the Federal Government. For example, the United States began minting in 1970 40 percent silver dollars commemorating the late President Dwight Eisenhower. Orders for these dollars will be accepted beginning July 1, 1971. It is estimated that during this year some 65 million uncirculated coins will be sold at \$3 per coin and some 5 million proof coins will be sold at \$10 per coin. Thus, revenue to the Federal Government for this issue in 1971 will be \$245 million, less the cost of materials, minting and distribution.

Similar revenues have been realized by other nations who have issued commemorative silver coins. A listing of some of these issues reflects not only the prestige of silver but the popularity of such commemorative coins. In 1968 the government of Mexico issued 27.2 million 25-peso coins to commemorate the Olympic Games. These coins are 72 percent silver. Japan issued a silver commemorative coin in honor of the Olympic Games in 1964 and sold 105 million of these coins. In 1969 the government of India minted 2 million silver coins in tribute to Mahatma Gandhi on the 100th anniversary of his birth. On the 25th anniversary of its liberation in World War II the Netherlands minted 5 million 10-gulden silver coins in 1970.

The American Mining Congress firmly believes that the U.S. Congress should specifically direct that silver be the principal metal to be used in both medals and coins which are to be struck in commemoration of the Bicentennial American Revolution.

With kindest regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

J. ALLEN OVERTON, JR.,  
*Executive Vice President.*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. In view of the references to the Franklin Mint advertisement, I think we also ought to place that in the record.

(The advertisement referred to faces page 118.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Are there any requests by other members to place any other material in the record?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Chairman, may we also place this brochure in the record? It is only four pages.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We may not be able to put pictures in, but we will check on that and if it is feasible we will include it.

(The brochure referred to faces page 118.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If no one has any further questions to ask, I thank you two gentlemen for giving us your opinions this afternoon on the legislation before us, the hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:15 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

(The following communications were subsequently received for inclusion in the record at this point:)

POSTMASTERS OF AMERICA,  
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1971.

Mrs. MARY BROOKS,  
*Director, Bureau of the Mint,*  
*Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. BROOKS: We were surprised to learn that there is some consternation on your part and on the part of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission staff in regard to our new commemorative medal program.

Originally, we intended to issue only one commemorative medal, honoring the changeover from the Post Office Department to the United States Postal Service. For this purpose, we formed the Joint Postal Commemorative Committee, and we engaged the Franklin Mint to produce and market that issue on our behalf. The response encouraged us to meet again with the Franklin Mint people, just three weeks ago, and we were fortunate that their experience in producing a similar program in conjunction with United Nations stamps made it possible for them to provide us with a continuing program on such short notice.

We understand that a question has now been raised as to whether it is proper to use the word "official" in the identification of these medals and first day covers. In answer to this, we wish to advise that the word "official" has been traditionally used to identify any first day cover that has been officially postmarked on the first day of issue of the stamp contained thereon. Furthermore, both the medals and first day covers are official issues of our jointly established organization, Postmasters of America. The use of the word "official" in either of these contexts is both traditional and appropriate.

Also, we understand that the thought was expressed that we should not have started our new program with the American Bicentennial stamp that will be issued July 4, because the A.R.B.C. was also planning to issue a medallion first day cover in conjunction with that stamp. We find this argument hard to fathom. Our basic plan is to issue a medallion first day cover in conjunction with *every commemorative stamp* issued by the new U.S. Postal Service. We could not possibly have eliminated the very first issue of this series and still have maintained the integrity of that program. We thought that the A.R.B.C. should be very pleased with the fact that our first issue helped to publicize the American Bicentennial celebration, which we believed to be their main objective.

On behalf of the more than 31,000 postmasters, which our organization represents, we can assure you that we wish to cooperate with you in every way possible and we hope that this letter will clear up any misunderstandings which have developed.

Sincerely,

EDWARD V. DORSEY,  
*Executive Director,*  
*National Association of Postmasters of the United States.*  
OLIVER CORONA,  
*Executive Director,*  
*National League of Postmasters.*

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION OF TEXAS,  
*Austin, Tex., July 9, 1971.*

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
*Rayburn Office Building,*  
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: It has come to our attention that the Honorable Wright Patman has introduced a bill (H.R. 7987) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. We, on the Texas Commission, recommend this Bill to your favorable consideration.

Yours sincerely,

GENE JONES RIDDLE (Mrs. Walter),  
*Associate Executive Director.*

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION,  
*Washington, D.C., July 26, 1971.*

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: As Vice Chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, I wish to record my endorsement of H.R. 7987 which would authorize a program of commemorative medals struck by the United States mint in connection with the Bicentennial of the United States.

The program anticipated under the legislation is well conceived and balances the various interests of the Government, the general public, and the private



sector. In my judgment, it is a fitting program for this great occasion and I urge enactment of H.R. 7987.

Sincerely,

HOBART LEWIS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1971.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,  
*Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee,*  
*Rayburn House Office Building.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission may I take this opportunity to express my support of H.R. 7987, the ARBC medals bill, scheduled to be considered in the near future by your Committee.

The medals program as outlined in the bill is one of the most important programs the Commission has planned. It will be one of the highlights of the nation's 200th anniversary celebration helping to generate a patriotic spirit among the people.

The medals program will not only reflect great historical events in the growth of our nation, but can serve to point out the guiding principles of our Republic. The medals authorized struck will also help focus world wide attention on the bicentennial.

I trust the Banking and Currency Committee will give quick approval to this important part of the national celebration.

Best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST.

BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION OF FLORIDA.  
*Pensacola, Fla., July 30, 1971.*

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, House Banking and Currency Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN: This is to urge passage of H.R. 7987 to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

The National Bicentennial Commission needs to get into this work immediately. Otherwise the country is going to be barraged by unofficial, unauthorized medals as indicated by the attached telegram.

We in Florida consider it imperative that the authorized National Bicentennial organization have control of the medal program and that such control be shared with the states, which I understand is the National Commission's plan.

Sincerely,

PAT DODSON, *Chairman.*

[Telegram]

THE FRANKLIN MINT.  
*Franklin Center, Pa., July 22, 1971.*

MR. PAT DODSON,  
*Chairman, Florida Bicentennial Commission, Department of Transportation, Tallahassee, Fla.*

We are pleased to inform you that the Board of Directors of the Franklin Mint, the Nation's foremost private mint, has authorized the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for a series of fifty State bicentennial medals to be promoted in a manner designed to generate at least an additional \$1,000,000 in contributions to be divided amongst the participating State bicentennial commissions for the furtherance of bicentennial activities. Further details on this program will be forthcoming within two to three weeks. In the meantime, if you have developed any preliminary plans for the issuance of any bicentennial medal or medals in your State, we would appreciate hearing from you immediately so that we can try to factor your plans into this program.

FRANCIS J. FITZPATRICK,  
*Vice President, Public Affairs.*

MOSS INTERNATIONAL,  
PUBLIC AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS CONSULTANTS.  
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1971.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Banking and Currency Com-  
mittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: As consultant to Paramount International Coin Corporation, I attended the hearings of your subcommittee recently on H.R. 7987 having to do with Bicentennial medals. The duty turned out to be quite a pleasure because of the interesting information and views elicited from the witnesses and I offer my congratulations.

There is one point on which I can shed some information on behalf of Paramount which may be helpful to you and your colleagues. There was concern expressed by your subcommittee as to the cost of the program of a national medal, and the PNC combination—possibly involving the striking of millions of pieces for which the Treasury must be assured of payment by the Commission. Although this question wasn't posed directly at the time, I thought you might like to know that the Commission will not have to look to the Congress for appropriations for this purpose and that no Federal funds need to be involved in the production of the medals by the Bureau of the Mint, as might be assumed.

As you may know, Paramount is the world's largest distributor of numismatic items and, among its activities, acts as numismatic agent for a number of governments. The company has felt from the outset that it should make its facilities available to the Commission to assist it in any way it can in the important years ahead.

Toward this end the company has assured the Commission that the company would arrange the entire financing of production and distribution of the Treasury medals if we were selected to act as distributing agent for the Commission in this matter.

For the record, this was made an official communication to the Commission on April 3, 1969 and confirmed again on December 10, 1970.

Cost is, of course, only one aspect of such a program but I thought you might like to have this information in connection with your consideration of the measure before you.

Cordially,

EDWARD K. MOSS.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION.  
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1971.

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on  
Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I wish to thank you, Madam Chairman and the members of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee for the thorough hearing conducted on H.R. 7987 which would authorize the United States Mint to strike certain medals in connection with the Bicentennial of the United States. I regret that I could not have appeared personally in support of the bill.

However, George E. Lang, American Revolution Bicentennial Commission member and Chairman of the Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, ably appeared on behalf of the Commission and, of course, represented my views as well.

I do, however, wish to record my support for the bill and urge its enactment. In my judgment the numismatic program recommended by the Commission and incorporated in the bill is well considered and takes into account the interests of the Government, the private sector, and the general public. Certainly the commemorative medals program commensurate with the importance of the occasion, H.R. 7987 will assure such a program.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. MAHONEY.



## APPENDIX

---

(The following additional material was submitted for the record:)

### AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

*Washington, D.C., August 7, 1970.*

#### PRESS RELEASE

Mr. George E. Lang, a Commissioner on the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and Chairman of the Commission's Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals, has announced October 1, 2, and 3 as the first official plenary session of the Advisory Panel. The meeting will take place in Washington, D.C.

The Advisory Panel is presently composed of such distinguished members from the numismatic area as Herbert Bercen (President, American Numismatic Association), the Honorable Mary Brooks (Director of the Bureau of the Mint), Elvira Clain-Stefanelli (Curator, Division of Numismatics, Smithsonian Institution), Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli (Curator, Division of Numismatics, Smithsonian Institution), Henry Grunthal (Curator, American Numismatic Society), the Honorable Mark Hatfield (United States Senate), Douglas MacAgy (National Endowment for the Arts), Clifford Mishler (Editor, *Numismatic News*), Margo Russell (Editor, *Coin World*), Don Taxay (Author), the Honorable Frederick Schwengel (United States House of Representatives), the Honorable Charles E. Walker (Assistant Secretary of the Treasury). The Advisory Panel has been in the past a quasi-official body working towards developing a commemorative numismatic program for the Bicentennial Era (1970-1983).

Interest has begun to accelerate in the numismatic field as ideas concerning changes in the coin-of-the-realm, national, state, and award medals are considered for commemorative use.

The Bicentennial Commission submitted the first of their annual reports to the President on the 4th of July, 1970, which stated in part, "A comprehensive study on the use of commemorative medals and coins to perpetuate the Bicentennial Era is well underway. A special advisory panel of experts in the field of numismatics intends to deliver its recommendations by the last quarter, 1970."

The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was established under President Johnson on July 4, 1966, to "prepare an overall program for commemorating the bicentennial of the American Revolution, and to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate observances and activities commemorating the historic events that preceded and are associated with the American Revolution," as quoted from Public Law 89-491.

Mr. F. Patrick Butler, staff coordinator for the Commission's Coins and Medals program will be attending the American Numismatic Association's Convention in St. Louis (August 18-22) to observe activities and provide the numismatic public with information on the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

---

#### PRESS RELEASE

### AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

*Washington, D.C., September 30, 1970.*

The Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has just concluded its initial two-day session in Washington, D.C. Called the most distinguished assemblage of numismatists ever gathered together, the purpose of the Panel is to advise the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission on the most suitable coin and medal program for the Bicentennial Era.

The first-day public session on Tuesday, September 29, consisted of hearing a series of position papers on this subject. The papers were initiated by Mr. Mary Brooks, Director of the Bureau of the Mint, who opposed any special

commemorative coin, as being contrary to existing legislation and Treasury policy. She did state, however, "It would be appropriate for the Mint to produce the national medal in honor of the nation's 200th Anniversary, and the Mint is prepared to release it at cost to the Bicentennial Commission for distribution and sale." She added, "We would also like to see a national campaign launched by the Commission inviting the nation's artists to submit designs for this medal with the entries to be judged by a panel of experts cognizant of the special requirements of committing an artistic design to metal."

Mr. Joseph Segal, President of the largest privately owned mint in the world, The Franklin Mint, made a strong plea that the Commission not directly involve itself in a commemorative medal program, since some companies, including the Franklin Mint, were already involved in producing medals in anticipation of 1976. "Encouraging private enterprise and localized private and public organizations to do all they wish to commemorate the American Revolution, without Federal competition, is in the finest tradition of this philosophy," was the position of the Franklin Mint.

The Medallic Art Company's President, Mr. William Louth, of New York City favored a new coinage for the anniversary and stated that his company stood ready to assist the entire coins and medals program of the Bicentennial Era in whatever manner possible.

Mr. Edward Moss of Paramount International Coin Corporation, the largest distributor of coins and medals in the world, told the Advisory Panel of many of the factors involved in the production and distribution of coins and medals. He, too, advocated that the U.S. Mint strike the official Bicentennial medal.

The President of the American Numismatic Association, Herbert M. Bergen, presented to the Advisory Panel the position he felt was held by the majority of the 26,000 members of his coin and medal collectors association. He advocated "extremely broad changes in our current coins and currency." He also felt that a variety of medals should be issued by a number of sources, but that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission should issue two official medals. One would be an award medal for use by the Commission, while the other would be a large 2½" to 3" official display medallion in bronze to be sold to the public at reasonable cost. A small coin-like copy of this official medallion should be offered to the public in unlimited quantities according to Mr. Bergen.

The second day of the meeting, Wednesday, September 30, was taken up with extensive discussions about the proposed Bicentennial coins and medals program to be recommended. The initial findings and recommendations of the Advisory Panel will be presented to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission at its next meeting in Washington on October 27.

This distinguished Advisory Panel is chaired by Mr. George Lang of Restaurant Associates Industries, Inc., of New York City, Chairman of the Events and Exhibitions Committee of the Bicentennial Commission, while Mrs. Margo Russell, Editor of "Coin World" is the Vice Chairman of the Advisory Panel. The panel members include:

Mr. Herbert M. Bergen, President, American Numismatic Association.

Mrs. Elvira Clain-Stefanelli, Curator, The National Museum of History and Technology.

Dr. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli, Curator, The National Museum of History and Technology.

Mr. Henry Grunthal, Curator of European and Modern Coins, The American Numismatic Society.

Mr. Clifford Mishler, Editor, Numismatic News.

Mr. Don Taxay, Flushing, New York.

From Federal Agencies:

The Honorable Mary Brooks, Director of the Bureau of the Mint.

Mr. Douglas MacAgy, National Endowment for the Arts.

Honorable Charles Walker, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 30, 1970]

#### U.S. IS ASKED TO CHANGE DESIGN OF COIN FOR BICENTENNIAL

The president of The Franklin Mint in Wawa yesterday recommended that the design of all U.S. coins be changed for the year 1976 to commemorate the nation's Bicentennial.



Joseph M. Segel made the recommendation before the opening session of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission's Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals in Washington, D.C.

Segel was one of five coin experts who presented position papers to the panel.

In his testimony before the panel, Segel said that the recommended change in coin designs would "guarantee the involvement of our entire population by putting the Bicentennial message, literally, at the fingertips of every man, woman and child in this country."

#### SUCCESS IN CANADA

He said that in 1967 Canada changed all of its coin designs to commemorate its centennial and "the idea proved enormously successful with the public."

Segel suggested that the designs be selected in a national competition to "involve a maximum number of talents in Bicentennial activities."

He proposed that the U.S. Mint begin producing the Bicentennial coins three or more years before the 1976 celebration and stockpile them as the British government stockpiled its new decimal coins before putting them in circulation.

#### PROOF SET REVENUES

Segel said The Franklin Mint could produce upwards of two billion coins a year to supplement U.S. Mint production if that were necessary.

The Franklin Mint on Baltimore pike is a private mint—reputedly the world's largest—and primarily produces commemorative medals for collectors and currency for foreign countries.

Segel also suggested that Congress assign the revenue from the sale of proof sets of the Bicentennial coins to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and predicted that the proceeds "would undoubtedly raise more money than the sale of commemorative medals or any other fund raising activity."

He recommended that the national commission not interfere with state bicentennial commissions' programs to raise funds through commemorative medal issues.

He added that The Franklin Mint plans to offer a 50-medal History of the American Revolution series to the various state bicentennial commissions as well as a coordinated medal program for fund raising purposes.

---

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1970]

#### COLLECTORS PRESENT POSITION FOR BICENTENNIAL

Important exploratory sessions of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission were held in Washington Tuesday and Wednesday, involving coins, paper money and the medallic arts as a means of marking the 200th anniversary of our independence.

Position papers were presented Tuesday by the Mint and the American Numismatic Association, and philosophies involving the medallic art area were set forth by the Franklin Mint, Medallic Art Co. and Paramount International Coin Corp.

Among those participating were Mrs. Mary T. Brooks, director of the Mint; Miss Eva B. Adams, former director; Douglas MacAgy, special assistant to the chairman, National Endowment for the Arts; and George R. Lang, commissioner.

Also: Joseph M. Segel (Franklin Mint), Max J. Hubert (Paramount), William Louft (Medallic Art), sculptor Ralph J. Menconi (Presidential Art Medals) and Margo Russell (Coin World).

Mrs. Brooks, early in Tuesday's "open" session, tossed a wet blanket on proceedings by restating Treasury and Mint opposition to non-circulating commemorative coinage, and even to a potential change in coin designs.

She did offer a hope that the Mint might have especially packaged proof and uncirculated year sets for 1976 that an American Revolution Bicentennial medal may be released, and that consideration was being given to reviving the Mint's Revolutionary War medals.

The Mint director, however, was careful to stress that Treasury and the Mint, whatever their experiences and beliefs, would abide by the decisions of Congress.

Despite Treasury-Mint opposition, participants were apparently virtually unanimous in the belief that new coinage should be planned and produced, and that time would permit the Mint to stockpile sufficient coins to meet anticipated demands.

Representatives of private mints, dominating the Tuesday afternoon session, offered their facilities if the Mint found it was unable to cope with production.

Aside from coins, expressions appeared to favor issuance of three types of medal—national, service (or award) and mass participation—each possibly in two or more metals, and two or more sizes.

Closed sessions were held Wednesday. From these meetings will come specific proposals, which will go to President Nixon for approval.

---

PRESS RELEASE

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

*Washington, D.C., February 19, 1971.*

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The first phase of a national Philatelic-Numismatic Commemorative Program for the celebration of the 200th Anniversary of America was announced today, exactly 1776 days before the official opening of the Bicentennial year, by David J. Mahoney, Chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (ARBC).

In its first recommendation, the Commission is calling for a change of design to be instituted on all coin-of-the-realm beginning in 1976. The action of the ARBC will now require approval by Congress.

Design changes on coins of the United States can only be changed once in every twenty-five years. All present circulation coinage (coin-of-the-realm) will have passed the required twenty-five year mark by 1976 with the exception of the 1959 reverse Lincoln Head cent and the recent Kennedy half dollar. Any change in these two coins would require additional special congressional consideration.

The Commission will be releasing more detailed information pertaining to the entire coins, medals, and stamps program for the benefit and interest of the general public, collectors, numismatists and philatelists as each phase of the program is finalized.

---

[H.R. 7374, 92d Cong., 1st sess., introduced by Mr. Celler on April 7, 1971]

A BILL To amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes", approved July 4, 1966 (80 Stat. 259), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 2(b)(3) is amended by adding the words "The Secretary of the Treasury" after the words "The Secretary of State";

(2) Section 2(b)(4) is redesignated as section 2(b)(5) and is amended by striking out "seventeen" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five".

(3) By adding a new section 2(b)(4) to read as follows:

"(4) Four members of the Federal judiciary to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States;"

SEC. 2. Section 6(b) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (b)(1) The Chairman, with the advice of the Commission, shall appoint a Director who will be compensated at level IV of the Executive Schedule, and three Deputy Directors who will be compensated at level V of the Executive Schedule. Such officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Chairman.

"(2) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as it deems advisable and to appoint such advisory committees as it deems necessary.

"(3) The Commission shall delegate such powers and duties to the Director (with power to redelegate) as necessary for the efficient operation and management of the Commission."



SEC. 3. Section 7(a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, to remain available until expended."

SEC. 4. Add at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 8. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Commission is further authorized to provide for—

"(1) the preparation, distribution, dissemination, exhibition, and sale of historical, commemorative, and informational materials and objects which will contribute to public information awareness and interest in the bicentennial;

"(2) competitions, commissions and awards for historical, scholarly, artistic, literary, musical, and other works, programs, and projects relating to the Bicentennial; and

"(3) a Bicentennial Calendar or register of programs and projects, and in other ways provide a central clearinghouse for information and coordination regarding dates, events, places, documents, artifacts, and personalities of Bicentennial historical and commemorative significance.

"SEC. 9. The Commission is authorized to carry out a program of grants-in-aid in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall, subject to such regulations as it may prescribe:

"(1) Make equal grants in two successive years of not to exceed \$45,000 annually to each State, Territory, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, upon application therefor, to assist in the establishment or implementation of Bicentennial Commissions.

"SEC. 10. Appropriations or other funds available to any Government department or agency (including the Commission) for carrying out purposes related to or in furtherance of the Bicentennial commemoration may be transferred between the Commission and any such Federal department or agency as may be mutually agreed between them. Funds so transferred may be used for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the authorities governing the activities of any such department or agency or the authorities of this Act, provided the activities come within the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 5 Section 5108(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "2754" and inserting "2764".

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF H.R. 7374

##### GENERAL BACKGROUND

P.L. 89-491, as amended, which established the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission required the Commission to submit to the President a "comprehensive report incorporating its specific recommendations for the commemoration of the Bicentennial and related events." The above Act further provides that the President "shall transmit the Commission's Report to the Congress together with such comments and recommendations for legislation and such report of administrative action taken by him as he deems appropriate."

The ARBC Report was submitted to the President on July 4, 1970. The President transmitted the Report to the Congress with his comments and recommendations on September 11, 1970. The President endorsed the primary recommendations that:

"The commemoration be national in scope, seeking to involve every State, city and community;

"The Bicentennial be a focal point for a review and reaffirmation of the principles on which the nation was founded and for a new understanding of our heritage;

"This be the occasion for looking ahead, for defining and dedicating ourselves to our common purposes, and for speeding the accomplishment of specific local projects responsive to our changing national priorities.

"The goal which the Commission has established is most appropriate for our nation at this time; 'to forge a new national commitment, a new spirit for '76, a spirit which vitalizes the ideals for which the Revolution was fought; a spirit which will unite the nation in purpose and dedication to the advancement of human welfare as it moves into its third century.'"

The President also concurred "with the Commission's concept of a Bicentennial Era with its focal point in 1976".

The President further stated that :

"The Commission will have important operational responsibilities: the Bicentennial Calendar, publications, films, the setting of standards and the coordination and monitoring of many projects closely tied to the national celebration. It may be advisable to enlarge the Commission and constitute it as the 'Board of Directors' of a corporate structure equipped to deal with operating functions."

Thus, the draft bill is intended to provide the Commission with statutory authorities and an organizational framework, as suggested by the President, for moving from the planning to the development stage of the Bicentennial Era.

#### SECTION 1

Section 1 of the bill would enlarge the representation of the Commission from 37 to 50 members and restore the Commission balance, as initially established, to 50 percent public and 50 percent Government representation.

Section 1(1) would add the Secretary of the Treasury to the Commission. This addition is proposed in view of Commission consideration of commemorative medals and commemorative coins to perpetuate the Bicentennial. Also, studies are under way for possible changes in coins of the realm and in paper currency. The responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury in these areas make his representation on the Commission highly desirable.

Section 1(2) would increase public membership on the Commission from 17 to 25. This increase will permit wider geographic and other representation. The expanded and broadly representative Commission can better serve as a link between the Commission and the interests so represented from various sectors of American life.

Section 1(3) would add the Judiciary to the Commission, making the Commission representative of all three branches of the Federal Government. Such total representation from all branches of the Government appears appropriate for this important commemoration.

#### SECTION 2

This Section authorizes compensation of the Director at Level IV of the Executive Schedule (\$38,000) and three Deputy Directors at Level V of the Executive Schedule (\$36,000). Such compensation is commensurate with the duties of such personnel and is consistent with salary levels of comparable officers of the Government. These officers would be appointed by the Chairman, with the advice of the Commission, and serve at his pleasure.

Under Section 2(3) the Director will be delegated responsibility for the operation and management of the Commission staff and will be, in effect, its Chief Executive Officer.

Under current planning, the three Deputy Director positions will be established as a Deputy Director for Communications and Field Services, a Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, and a Deputy Director for Program Development and Coordination.

It should be noted that Section 5 of the bill authorizes 10 positions at super-grade levels with appointments to be made under normal Civil Service and classification procedures.

The appointment and compensation authorities of the bill will permit the Commission to develop and retain a capable staff to plan and administer a nationwide Bicentennial program in keeping with the opportunities and challenges of the occasion.

#### SECTION 3

This section authorizes appropriations for the Commission during its statutory tenure. The current authorization expires on June 30, 1971.

Also, the Section authorizes the availability of appropriations until expended. This fiscal flexibility is proposed because of the nature of the Commission activities which necessitate long range planning and development over the entire Bicentennial Era, looking toward 1976 as the focal year.

#### SECTION 4

Section 4 clarifies and amplifies specific authorities to assist the Commission in carrying out its statutory mandate to plan, develop, encourage and coordinate a total program of local, State, national and international activities.



Section 4 adds a new Section 8 to P.L. 89-491 which authorizes the Commission to arrange for the preparation of materials and objects relating to the Bicentennial and for their distribution, exhibition and sale. Such items may include, for example, pamphlets, manuscripts and films, commemorative and historical artifacts and other mementoes. It is anticipated that the Commission will work closely with State and local Commissions and with patriotic, historical and service groups and organizations to assure the availability of such materials.

The new Section 8(2) to be added to P.L. 89-491 authorizes the Commission to conduct competitions for historical research, essays, musical works, poems, etc., relating to the Bicentennial and to commission and give awards for such works. The Commission expects to stimulate interest at all levels, from school children to recognized professionals, to produce works which will promote and perpetuate understanding of 200 years of national development.

The new Section 8(3) authorizes the Commission to initiate a Bicentennial Calendar of programs and projects and provide a central clearing house for information and coordination regarding dates, events, places, documents, personalities, etc., of Bicentennial historical and commemorative significance.

The Commission will relate to national organizations, special interest groups, Foreign Governments and organizations, State, regional and local organizations, and private individuals. It will be constantly receiving from and providing relevant data and information to such groups. A computer system will most probably be developed to perform this task which the Commission believes is one of its most important services to assure the success of a nation-wide commemoration.

Under the proposed authorities, the Commissioner will carry out directly programs and activities such as indicated above. However, as a general rule Federal programs will be carried out by existing departments and agencies to the extent feasible and practicable, consistent with the statutory responsibilities of the National Commission for the overall planning, encouraging, developing and coordination of local, State, national and international activities.

The new Section 9 to be added to P.L. 89-491 authorizes a program of initial grants in-aid to each State, Territory, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to assist in the establishment or implementation of Bicentennial Commissions.

An objective of the Commission is that the commemoration be national in scope, involving every State, city and community—truly a grass roots commemoration.

The Commission believes that State Bicentennial Commissions can be an important catalyst in stimulating interest and in coordinating local activities and programs. At the present time, a majority of States have established Commissions. However, most Commissions have neither funds nor staff. The purpose of a proposed grant program is to provide equal grants to all States of not to exceed \$45,000 in two successive years to help develop viable and active Commissions which can stimulate and develop appropriate programs and activities in their State. The grants under this Section would be made to that entity determined by law or certified by the Governor (or other paramount authority) as responsible for Bicentennial activities in a particular State, Territory, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The new Section 10 of P.L. 89-491 would permit funds appropriated for any Bicentennial purpose to be transferred between the Commission and other Federal departments and agencies for expenditures for such purposes. Any such transfer requires the concurrence of the head of both the Commission and the Federal department or agency concerned. This provision will provide flexibility in the planning and carrying out of Bicentennial programs within the Executive Branch.

#### SECTION 5

Section 5 of the bill would increase by 10 the total number of super-grade positions authorized in the Executive Branch. This will provide the Civil Service Commission with 10 additional spaces for use by the Bicentennial Commission in accordance with normal Civil Service Classification Procedures (See discussion under Section 2.)

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., May 30, 1971]

#### BICENTENNIAL MEDALS WON'T BE OUT JULY 4

The first of its series of commemorative medals will not be ready July 4, as the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission had planned, but officials hope to release it late this year or early in 1972.

Bills have been introduced in the House by Chairman Wright Patman of the Banking and Currency Committee and in the Senate by Chairman John Sparkman of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs authorizing the secretary of the Treasury to strike not fewer than six nor more than 13 such medals. No action has been taken on them.

The bills also provide for the striking of a single national medal for 1976, the bicentennial year, to be issued no earlier than July 4, 1975, and with sale to end by Dec. 31, 1983. The medals may be in varied sizes and in common or precious metals, with a minimum order of 2,000 of each design.

The 13 commemorative medals, one each year from 1971 through 1983, or a minimum of six from 1971 through 1976 are to be part of a special philatelic-numismatic combination, a medal and a related postage stamp, in a specially designed envelope canceled on Independence Day or another date of historic significance.

These are to be packaged by a private firm in the name of the commission. The first was to have been ready this July 4.

In addition to the national and commemorative medals to be struck by the U.S. Mint, the commission plans an awards medal for outstanding service and state medals to be authorized by each state. Since these are to be produced by private mints, no congressional authorization is necessary.

---

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION,  
*Washington, D.C., June 1, 1971.*

MEMORANDUM

To: State Bicentennial Commission Chairmen and State Representatives.  
From: Charles F. Goodspeed, Acting State Coordinator.  
Subject: National-State Commission Communication.

The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has been in contact with many State Commissions. We have also had the pleasure of meeting with many State representatives involved in Bicentennial planning and the opportunity to discuss matters of mutual concern.

Now that the Commission has entered the implementation stage of development, there must be a closer and more continuous exchange of ideas and plans to help and reinforce each other to make the Bicentennial a national and State success.

Thanks to the meetings we have held in San Francisco and Dallas, plus your answers to our State Questionnaire, phone calls, and considerable correspondence, I hope we have captured your interests in keeping with our purpose as a Congressional authorized and Presidential appointed Commission.

To this end we are preparing a *State Handbook* which will be a loose-leaf compilation of information on Bicentennial matters that can be kept current as planning progresses. This will be sent to all State Commissions in the near future.

Also, we will continue to circularize the State Commissions on important ARBC information.

This communication is a forerunner of such circulars, Circular #1 (attached) is concerned with proposed legislation to reorganize the national Commission and its program activity. Circular #2 (attached) deals with the policy and programs of the Federal Government with regard to commemorative coins and medals to perpetuate the Bicentennial. The circular relates the development of the ARBC coins and medals policy and programs, its current status, and proposed implementation.

So that this Commission can be continuously responsive to the majority of ideas, may we have your additional suggestions.

CIRCULAR No. 1

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO REORGANIZE THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION  
BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION AND ITS PROGRAM ACTIVITY

The ARBC is presently in a state of transition, shifting its emphasis from the development of an overall plan for a nation-wide Bicentennial commemoration to the initiation of implementation of the plan.

In transmitting the ARBC plan to the Congress, the President said:



"The Commission will have important operational responsibilities; the Bicentennial Calendar, publications, films, the setting of standards and the coordination and monitoring of many projects closely tied to the national celebration. It may be advisable to enlarge the Commission. . . . I am asking Chairman Mahoney to meet with Director Shultz and to recommend to me a plan for future Commission organization and funding."

Accordingly, legislation has been submitted to the Congress which is intended to provide the Commission with statutory authorities and an organizational structure for moving from the planning to the development stage of the Bicentennial era.

Such legislation was introduced in the House by Congressman Emanuel Celler as H.R. 7374 and has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. (An identical bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Brooke as S. 1857). Copies of the bill are attached.

The bill would:

- Increase ARBC membership to 50 by addition of four members of the Federal Judiciary, the Secretary of the Treasury, and eight additional public members.

- Provide new grade and salary structure for staff.

- Extend the ARBC authorization for appropriations.

- Provide authorization for preparation and dissemination of historical, commemorative and informational materials; for competitions, commissions and awards for historical scholarly and other Bicentennial related works; and for the establishment of a Bicentennial Calendar or register of programs and projects and a Bicentennial clearing house for information and coordination.

- Authorize two annual start-up grants to each State, Territory and Possession of not to exceed \$45,000 each to assist in the establishment or implementation of State Bicentennial Commissions.

The White House has endorsed the legislation and in fact considers that its enactment "would be in accord with the program of the President".

The Commission solicits the views and suggestions of your State Commission on the legislation and on any additional proposals for implementation of the Bicentennial planning through legislative means or otherwise.

CIRCULAR No. 2

#### COINS AND MEDALS PROGRAM

In the Joint Resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (P.L. 89-491) the Congress directed the Commission to prepare an overall plan for commemorating the Bicentennial of the American Revolution, to include activities such as the issuance of commemorative coins and medals.

Accordingly, the Commission carefully considered the role of coin-of-the-realm and commemorative medals in perpetuating the Bicentennial of the United States.

A professional group of numismatists was selected in 1970 as an Advisory Panel on Coins and Medals under the Chairmanship of Commissioner George E. Lang. The Panel was asked to determine broad recommendations for Bicentennial numismatic commemorative programs, to be submitted to the full Commission for development of its recommendations to the President and the Congress regarding coins and medals.

Panel membership included private individuals and Government representatives active in the coins and medals field (Panel membership attached).

On the basis of the Panel's deliberations and recommendations, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has recommended programs for perpetuation of the Bicentennial by means of commemorative medals and United States currency and coin-of-the-realm. The recommendations for commemorative medals are as follows:

#### COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

- That a *National Bicentennial Medal* be struck by the U.S. Mint.

- Such a medal would be singularly identifiable in both obverse and reverse design as the official national medal commemorating the Bicentennial.

- That a *Philatelic-Numismatic Commemorative* piece be struck by the U.S. Mint and issued annually for sale to the public for a period of not less than six and not more than thirteen years. Such commemorative medal would be combined with a special commemorative stamp (both represent-

ing the same event) in a specially designed envelope which is postmarked and cancelled on the eventful date at a pertinent historical location.

That an *Awards Medal* be created by the Commission, struck by private industry in very limited quantities and made of precious metals as a presentation piece in recognition of meritorious service.

That the State Bicentennial Commissions each establish a *State Medal* for distribution to the public and that their medals be struck by private organizations. The Commission is prepared to assist in developing uniform standards for the production of such a State Medal for 1976. The Commission can assist in developing overall size, composition and design of each State Medal so that the public may have the opportunity of acquiring one official, uniform set.

The Commission recommendations pertaining to commemorative medals to be struck by the U.S. Mint have been submitted to the Congress and introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Wright Patman together with Representatives Leonor Sullivan and William B. Widnall. An identical bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Sparkman, for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Proxmire and Mr. Tower (copy of bills attached). The recommendations for commemorative medals to be struck by private mints do not require Federal legislation.

The Commission believes that its recommendations for a comprehensive medals program will satisfy the needs of the general public and collectors and to perpetuate the Bicentennial by means of such historic mementos.

Also, the Commission and the Advisory Panel both believe that the proposed numismatic program is carefully balanced and takes into account the interests of the public, the collectors, private industry, and the U.S. Mint.





